

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 18, 1993

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Reverend James Healy, pastor, Our Lady Queen of Peace Catholic Church, Arlington, VA, offered the following prayer:

Creator God, You are truth, Your law is love. Make these, Your servants, called by Your people, unrelenting in their search for truth, unmatched in their witness to Your love.

Let Your Spirit hover over their daily deliberations. Give them patience and persistence in the face of frustration, conviction and courage in the art of compromise.

Make them passionate and persuasive in defense of the poor, discreet and discerning in demands of the rich. Let the Constitution be their charter and conscience their guide.

In matters of principle, make them inevitably serious, in matters of privilege, a little less so.

Make them bold and courageous in leadership, humble and attentive in service for the good of Your people and Your glory, Eternal God.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays 155, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—253

Abercrombie	Baessler	Bevill
Ackerman	Barcia	Bilbray
Andrews (ME)	Barlow	Bishop
Andrews (NJ)	Barrett (WI)	Blackwell
Andrews (TX)	Bateman	Bonior
Applegate	Becerra	Borski
Archer	Beilenson	Boucher
Bacchus (FL)	Berman	Brewster

Brooks	Hochbrueckner	Pastor
Browder	Hoke	Payne (NJ)
Brown (CA)	Holden	Payne (VA)
Brown (FL)	Houghton	Pelosi
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Penny
Bryant	Hughes	Peterson (FL)
Byrne	Hutto	Pickett
Cantwell	Hyde	Pickle
Cardin	Inglis	Pombo
Carr	Inslee	Pomeroy
Chapman	Jefferson	Poshard
Clayton	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Clement	Johnson (SD)	Rahall
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Coleman	Kanjorski	Ravenel
Collins (IL)	Kaptur	Reed
Collins (MI)	Kennedy	Reynolds
Combest	Kennelly	Richardson
Condit	Kildee	Roemer
Conyers	Kleczka	Rose
Cooper	Klein	Rostenkowski
Coppersmith	Klink	Roth
Costello	Kopetski	Rowland
Coyne	Kreidler	Roybal-Allard
Cramer	LaFalce	Rush
Danner	Lambert	Sabo
Darden	Lancaster	Sanders
de la Garza	Lantos	Sangmeister
Deal	LaRocco	Sarpalius
DeLauro	Lehman	Sawyer
Dellums	Levin	Schenk
Derrick	Lewis (GA)	Schumer
Deutsch	Lipinski	Scott
Dicks	Lloyd	Serrano
Dingell	Long	Sharp
Dixon	Lowey	Shepherd
Dooley	Maloney	Sisisky
Durbin	Mann	Skaggs
Edwards (CA)	Manton	Skelton
Edwards (TX)	Margolies	Slattery
Engel	Mezvisinsky	Slaughter
English (AZ)	Markey	Smith (IA)
English (OK)	Martinez	Smith (NJ)
Eshoo	Matsui	Snowe
Evans	Mazzoli	Stark
Fazio	McCloskey	Stenholm
Fields (LA)	McCollum	Stokes
Filner	McCurdy	Strickland
Fingerhut	McDermott	Studds
Fish	McHale	Stupak
Flake	McKinney	Swett
Foglietta	McNulty	Swift
Ford (MI)	Meehan	Synar
Frank (MA)	Meek	Tanner
Frost	Menendez	Tauzin
Furse	Mfume	Tejeda
Gejdenson	Miller (CA)	Thornton
Gephardt	Minge	Thurman
Geren	Mink	Torricelli
Gibbons	Moakley	Towns
Gillmor	Mollohan	Trafigant
Gilman	Montgomery	Valentine
Glickman	Moran	Velazquez
Gonzalez	Murtha	Vento
Gordon	Myers	Visclosky
Green	Nadler	Volkmer
Gutierrez	Natcher	Waters
Hall (OH)	Neal (MA)	Watt
Hall (TX)	Neal (NC)	Waxman
Hamburg	Oberstar	Wheat
Hamilton	Obey	Whitten
Harman	Olver	Wise
Hayes	Ortiz	Woolsey
Hefner	Orton	Wyden
Hilliard	Owens	Wynn
Hinchey	Pallone	Yates
Hoagland	Parker	

NAYS—155

Allard	Ballenger	Bereuter
Armey	Barrett (NE)	Bilirakis
Bachus (AL)	Bartlett	Bliley
Baker (CA)	Barton	Blute
Baker (LA)	Bentley	Boehner

Boehner	Hoekstra	Porter
Bonilla	Horn	Pryce (OH)
Bunning	Huffington	Quinn
Burton	Hunter	Ramstad
Buyer	Hutchinson	Regula
Callahan	Inhofe	Ridge
Calvert	Istook	Roberts
Camp	Jacobs	Rogers
Canady	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Clinger	Kasich	Roukema
Coble	Kim	Royce
Collins (GA)	King	Santorum
Cox	Kingston	Saxton
Crane	Klug	Schaefer
Crapo	Knollenberg	Schiff
Cunningham	Kolbe	Schroeder
DeLay	Kyl	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart	Lazio	Shaw
Dickey	Leach	Shays
Doolittle	Levy	Shuster
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Skeen
Duncan	Lewis (FL)	Smith (MI)
Dunn	Lightfoot	Smith (OR)
Emerson	Linder	Smith (TX)
Everett	Livingston	Solomon
Ewing	Machley	Spence
Fawell	Manzullo	Stearns
Fowler	McCandless	Stump
Franks (CT)	McCrery	Sundquist
Franks (NJ)	McDade	Talent
Galleghy	McHugh	Taylor (MS)
Gekas	McInnis	Taylor (NC)
Gilchrest	McKeon	Thomas (CA)
Goodlatte	McMillan	Thomas (WY)
Goodling	Meyers	Torkildsen
Goss	Mica	Upton
Grams	Michel	Vucanovich
Grandy	Miller (FL)	Walker
Greenwood	Molinar	Walsh
Gunderson	Moorhead	Weld
Hancock	Morella	Wolf
Hansen	Nussle	Young (AK)
Hastert	Oxley	Young (FL)
Hefley	Packard	Zeliff
Herger	Paxon	Zimmer
Hobson	Petri	

NOT VOTING—22

Clay	Henry	Torres
DeFazio	Johnston	Tucker
Dorman	Laughlin	Unsoeld
Fields (TX)	Mineta	Washington
Ford (TN)	Murphy	Williams
Gallo	Peterson (MN)	Wilson
Gingrich	Quillen	
Hastings	Spratt	

□ 1126

Mr. COBLE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California [Mr. McKEON] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. McKEON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 904. An act to amend the Airport and Airway Safety, Capacity, Noise Improvement, and Intermodal Transportation Act of 1992 with respect to the establishment of the National Commission to Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 80. An act to increase the size of the Big Thicket National Preserve in the State of Texas by adding the Village Creek corridor unit, the Big Sandy corridor unit, and the Canyonlands unit;

S. 164. An act to authorize the adjustment of the boundaries of the South Dakota portion of the Sioux Ranger District of Custer National Forest, and for other purposes;

S. 214. An act to authorize the construction of a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II and to commemorate U.S. participation in that conflict;

S. 252. An act to provide for certain land exchanges in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes;

S. 275. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the town of Taos, NM, and for other purposes;

S. 326. An act to revise the boundaries of the George Washington Birthplace National Monument, and for other purposes;

S. 328. An act to provide for the rehabilitation of historic structures within the Sandy Hook Unit of Gateway National Recreation Area in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes;

S. 344. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Fox and Lower Wisconsin River corridors in the State of Wisconsin as a National Heritage Corridor, and for other purposes; and

S. 375. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating a segment of the Rio Grande in New Mexico as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 102-240, the Chair, announced on behalf of the majority leader his appointment of Dana Connors of Maine, as a member of the National Council on Surface Transportation Research.

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276d-276g, of title 22, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. METZENBAUM, as chairman of the Senate delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group during the 103d Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 403(a)(2) of Public Law 100-533, as amended, the Chair, announced on behalf of the majority leader his reappointment of Mary Ann Campbell of Arkansas and his appointment of Barbara Aiello of Maine, as

members of the National Women's Business Council.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not recognize Members for 1-minute requests at this time.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 69, noes 343, answered "present" 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

AYES—69

Allard
Armey
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Bartlett
Bentley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Collins (GA)
Crane
Crapo
DeLay
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Everett
Fawell

Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gekas
Gillmor
Goodling
Greenwood
Hancock
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Houghton
Hunter
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
King
Kingston
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Livingston

McCandless
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinar
Myers
Paxon
Pombo
Pryce (OH)
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Shaw
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stump
Sundquist
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Vucanovich
Walsh
Young (AK)

NOES—343

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell

Bliley
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Candady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn

Coble
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combust
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks

Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dreier
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Orton
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl

LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Levin
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Saxton
Mezvinsky
Markay
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed

Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Santorum
Sarpalilus
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenck
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Siskis
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmmer
Walker
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Taylor (NC)

NOT VOTING—17

Clay	Gallo	Tauzin
Dellums	Gingrich	Tucker
Dornan	Henry	Washington
Fields (TX)	Lehman	Williams
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Wilson
Ford (TN)	Quillen	

□ 1145

Ms. SCHENK, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. HUTCHINSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 133 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 133

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read for amendment under the five-minute rule. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed and by the named proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in this resolution. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. If more than one amendment in the nature of a substitute is adopted, only the last to be adopted shall be considered as finally adopted and reported to the House. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been finally adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

□ 1150

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The gentleman from

California [Mr. BEILENSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary one-half hour of debate time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 133 is the rule providing for the further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 64, the concurrent resolution on the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998.

The rule makes in order the four substitutes printed in the Rules Committee report:

First, the Kasich substitute, debatable for 2 hours;

Second, the Solomon substitute, debatable for 1 hour;

Third, the Mfume substitute, for the Black Caucus, debatable for 1 hour;

And finally, the Sabo substitute, consisting of the text of House Concurrent Resolution 64 as reported by the House Budget Committee, debatable for 2 hours.

Should more than one of these substitutes be adopted, the rule provides that only the last to be adopted shall be reported to the House.

The rule waives all points of order against the four substitutes. It also provides a period of 20 minutes of concluding debate, after disposition of all the substitutes.

Finally, as provided for in the Congressional Budget Act, amendments needed to achieve mathematical consistency are also made in order.

Mr. Speaker, as Members are aware, the role of the Budget Committee is, and has always been, to develop a blueprint, a general plan, for the Federal budget.

The budget resolution is the mechanism through which Congress determines appropriate, overall Federal spending and revenue levels, and directs the Appropriations Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and the various authorizing committees, to report legislation which will achieve the goals outlined in the resolution.

Specific measures to implement the budget resolution—appropriations bills, and reconciliation legislation—will, of course, be considered later. It is through those bills that actual deficit-reduction measures will be debated and, eventually, enacted into law. Right now, today, our purpose is to consider total levels of spending and of revenues.

The Committee on Rules adopted a policy over a decade ago, I remind members, of making in order only comprehensive substitutes to the Budget Committee-reported budget resolution and, in most years, members of both parties have agreed on that approach,

on that framework. We adopted that policy for a number of reasons:

Primary among them, first, that we believe that program-level, or line-item amendments to a budget-resolution are inappropriate. Such amendments are the province of the authorizing, appropriating, and tax committees—not the Budget Committee—and are only appropriate for consideration when legislation from those committees is later considered by the House.

Second, program-level amendments unnecessarily prolong debate on the budget resolution. Years ago, when the Rules Committee allowed line-item amendments to the budget resolution, floor consideration of the resolution could often take several weeks—that is, weeks, not days but weeks. The amendments offered were often duplicative amendments, which were also offered to the authorizing and appropriating bills. It was not a constructive use of floor time.

As the minority members of the Rules Committee know, we are quite sympathetic to providing more open rules in many cases. But this is a case where it is completely inappropriate to allow anything more than the comprehensive alternatives that the committee has made, in fact, in order under this rule. The three substitutes made in order do, each of them, offer a comprehensive alternative to the budget as reported by the Budget Committee.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to commend, on behalf of all the members of the Committee on Rules, each of the three authors—the ranking minority member of the House Budget Committee, Mr. KASICH; the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]; and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME], and his colleagues on the Congressional Black Caucus—for the work they have done in putting together alternative fiscal plans, which do, in fact, give the Members of this House several different options for determining fiscal policy for the years ahead of us.

In all, Members will have four comprehensive budget blueprints, two Republican and two Democratic, from which to choose the best course for the Federal budget for the next 5 years.

I also wish to commend once again, as I did yesterday, and I am sure Members will join me in these remarks, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] for his diligent and effective work in developing a budget resolution in a very difficult time, one of great time constraints, a budget resolution that cuts an additional \$63 billion from Mr. Clinton's budget plan over the 5-year period from fiscal year 1994 through fiscal year 1998.

In all, the resolution, as reported by the Committee on the Budget, would reduce the Federal deficit by \$42 billion in fiscal year 1994 and by \$510 billion over the next 5 years.

These savings, may I again remind our colleagues, represent real, substantive cuts. Under the Committee on the Budget's plan, we will be spending less in actual dollars on discretionary programs in every year, from 1994 through 1998, then we spend in 1993. Thus, discretionary spending will be frozen, with no increase for inflation, for the next 5 years.

The remainder of the \$510 billion in deficit reduction is achieved through reconciliation instructions to 13 authorizing committees. Those savings will be enacted this year in a single, omnibus reconciliation bill through permanent changes in the law.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, our friends on the other side of the aisle have touted the change that has taken place in the Federal Government—the new beginning—the death knoll for gridlock. True, what we see on the floor today—and in fact almost every day of this fledgling 103d Congress—is an evolution out of gridlock. But gridlock to grief is not exactly what Americans had in mind, and this budget resolution brings us grief.

On the agenda today is a budget resolution that calls for more than \$300 billion in new taxes—for those who find billions hard to compute that translates into an average of \$500 a year in higher taxes for a typical family with an after-tax income of \$34,000. It's a budget for tens of billions of dollars of new spending with minimal and mostly vague spending constraints.

It's a budget that seems to ignore pleas from the American people to cut spending first and a budget that has disregarded collective proposals, including one of mine, to make specific and real budget cuts of hundreds of billions of dollars. It is a budget that leaves us with a rising deficit in 1998—even after enormous tax hikes and tremendous sacrifice.

And it is a budget resolution that will likely pass without the benefit of full scrutiny by all Members because the Democratic majority—even with its 80-vote advantage—has once again engineered a restrictive rule that shuts out many legitimate and relevant amendments. At the end of my remarks, I will submit the open rule substitute and the amendments and votes cast in the Rules Committee on this subject.

The distinguished minority whip asked the question most succinctly yesterday—just what is the Democratic leadership afraid of? What have we got to lose by debating the merits of Mr. WALKER's proposal? He suggested setting up a 10-percent checkoff so taxpayers can ensure that at least some of their money is being channeled to debt reduction.

And what is there to lose from discussing the distinguished minority

leader's very responsible proposal to guarantee that no extraneous provisions end up in this budget resolution as it moves through the process? And I cannot understand what we could possibly lose by considering substitutes offered by Mr. BURTON and others to simply limit the growth of all Government spending over 5 years?

In my view, we have absolutely nothing to lose and everything to gain by opening up this process. So I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle—what are you afraid of? And I implore my colleagues in this House to remember that our actions on the budget—our progress in reducing the deficit, creating jobs, and encouraging economic growth—will be the yardstick by which we will be judged.

Voting for a restrictive rule and more taxes, higher spending and minimal budget cuts will be remembered. Members who are unquestioningly following mandates of their leadership will have some explaining to do. I urge a "No" vote on the previous question so we can consider the merits of all the amendments. Failing that, I urge a "No" vote on this rule.

ROLLCALL VOTES IN THE RULES COMMITTEE ON THE PROPOSED RULE FOR THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

1. Dreier motion—for an open rule. Rejected, 3-7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, and Slaughter.

2. Solomon motion—to make in order Walker amendment No. 2 (see attached summary of amendments). Rejected, 3-7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, and Slaughter.

3. Solomon motion—to make in order Walker amendment No. 8. Rejected, 3-7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, and Slaughter.

4. Dreier motion—to make in order Barton amendment No. 3. Rejected, 3-7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, and Slaughter.

5. Goss motion—to make in order Heger amendment No. 4. Rejected, 3-7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, and Slaughter.

6. Goss motion—to make in order Allard amendment No. 12. Rejected, 3-7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, and Slaughter.

7. Dreier en bloc motion—to make in order the following amendments: Everett No. 5, Burton No. 7, Bentley No. 9, Allard No. 11, and Smith (MI) No. 13. Rejected, 3-7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, and Slaughter.

8. Derrick motion—to report rule. Adopted, 7-3. Yeas: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, and Slaughter. Nays: Solomon, Dreier, and Goss.

AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64

1. Sanders: Reduces defense (function 050) budget authority and outlays by \$15 billion in each of fiscal years 1994-1998. Transfers \$9

billion of that to Income Security (function 600) and \$6 billion to Education, Training (function 500) in each of fiscal years 1994-1998.

2. Walker: Directs Ways and Means and Government Operations Committees to report, by August 1, 1993. Ways and Means must recommend changes in law to allow taxpayers to designate up to 10 percent of their tax liability to retire the public debt. Government Operations must recommend changes in law to sequester each year (make automatic, across-the-board cuts in all spending except social security, debt payments and deposit insurance) an amount equal to the amount taxpayers designate for reducing the public debt.

3. Barton: Directs engrossing clerk to send to the Senate a joint resolution proposing a tax limitation/balanced budget constitutional amendment but only if the House adopts the conference report on the budget resolution by a vote of two-thirds of the total membership.

4. Heger: Reduces amount of total tax increases in each fiscal year by the amount assumed for increased taxes on Social Security benefits. Reduces spending in 5 functions (general science, energy, commerce and housing, transportation, and general government). The deficit amount would be correspondingly lowered in fiscal years 1994, 1996, and 1997 and would be increased in fiscal years 1995 and 1998.

5. Everett: Expresses sense of House that Members may not increase pay if budget deficit has occurred in previous Congress; Members should have pay reduced in deficit was not reduced by previous Congress.

6. Kasich: Reduces the budget deficit by \$38 billion in fiscal year 1994 and \$450 billion over 5 years. Achieves all savings through spending cuts, but includes some changes in user fees. Contains no spending or tax increases. Reforms, reduces or eliminates more than 160 programs. Reduces defense spending more than \$60 billion (half of the President's recommendation); increases retirement age of federal workers; creates block grant for food and nutrition programs; expands use of managed care in the Medicaid program; provides means testing for Medicare benefits for those with incomes over \$100,000; includes malpractice reform; cuts \$5.5 billion from energy programs; places moratorium on federal land purchases; funds highway programs at baseline levels; cuts federal government by \$48 billion over 5 years; cuts federal employees by 50,000 more than the President; freezes COLA's for federal employees, including Members of Congress.

7. Burton: Reduces the deficit by \$850 billion over 5 years by limiting the annual growth in overall federal spending to no more than 2 percent.

8. Michel: Establishes a point of order against extraneous matter in any reconciliation legislation considered at the direction of the fiscal year 1994 Budget Resolution. Permits Members to strike provisions that (1) have no budgetary impact, (2) increase outlays or decrease revenues where a committee has not met its reconciliation target, (3) increase outlays or decrease revenues in years beyond those covered by the reconciliation bill, and (4) provisions not in the jurisdiction of the Committee reporting the provisions.

9. Bentley: Caps the fiscal year 1994 budget aggregates and the allocations for each function at the fiscal year 1993 level, plus two percentage points. For fiscal years 1995-1998, caps aggregates and allocations at preceding year's amounts, plus two percentage points.

Directs the Committee of the Whole to report, by May 14, 1993, a reconciliation bill to reduce expenditures by not less than \$17.1 billion.

10. Solomon: Lowers total revenues by (1) eliminating several tax increases (including Btu tax, increase in tax on Social Security benefits, and corporate tax hike), (2) raising the income level at which the 36 percent individual tax rate begins (from \$140,000 to \$200,000 on joint returns), and (3) retaining 10 percent surtax on millionaires. To offset the revenue lost, includes all spending cuts from the Kasich substitute and includes \$30 billion in additional cuts (including elimination of Supercollider, stretchout of space station funding, further cuts in legislative branch funding—from 15 to 25 percent, and reduction by 50 percent for highway demonstration projects). Also directs appropriate committees to report, by May 1, 1993, (1) a balanced budget constitutional amendment, (2) legislation providing the President enhanced recess authority, and (3) legislation modifying maximum deficit amounts (MDAs) to reflect amounts in the resolution and to trigger sequestration if actual deficits exceed MDAs.

11. Allard: Decreases total new budget authority for fiscal year 1994 by \$1.673 billion. Decreases outlays as follows: \$650 million in fiscal year 1994, \$540 million in fiscal year 1995, \$291 million in fiscal year 1996, \$131 million in fiscal year 1997, and \$61 million in fiscal year 1998. Decreases deficit levels in cor-

responding amounts for each fiscal year. Specifies reductions by budget function, targeting those areas which traditionally have had earmarking or individual projects.

12. Allard: Decreases revenue levels in an amount equal to that which is estimated to result from a Btu tax. Reduces new spending in slightly larger amounts than what would be necessary to offset the lost revenues.

13. Smith (MI): Limits outlay expenditures in fiscal year 1994 to either (1) the outlay level of the Kasich substitute or (2) a limited freeze for fiscal year 1994. The freeze would limit the increase in Medicare and Medicaid expenditures to one-half the CBO estimate (approximately 6.5 percent above the fiscal year 1993 outlays) and permit an increase in Social Security to reflect the additional number of retirees projected. After 1994, the amendment would limit outlay expenditures to either (1) the outlay level of the Kasich substitute or (2) a 1 percent increase in each budget function, including Social Security (which would be adjusted to reflect the increased number of retirees). The amendment assumes the social Security retirement age would be extended by one month per year for 36 years.

14. Mfume: Redistributes among domestic discretionary functions to provide increases for education, competitiveness in new technologies, attacking homelessness and war on drugs. Rejects Btu tax; imposes new corporate and individual equity tax measures.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 95TH-103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted ¹	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Num-ber	Per-cent ²	Num-ber	Per-cent ³
95th (1977-78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979-80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981-82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983-84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985-86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987-88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989-90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991-92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993-94)	8	0	0	8	100

¹Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

²Open rules are those which permit any member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

³Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rules, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Source: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th-102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103rd Congress, through Mar. 17, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONG.

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D-5; R-25)	3 (D-0; R-3)	PQ: (264-176; A: 259-164, Feb. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: Motor voter	9 (D-1; R-8)	1 (D-0; R-1)	PQ: (248-171; A: 249-170, Feb. 4, 1993).
H. Res. 81, Feb. 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 6: Family planning	8 (D-0; R-8)	1 (D-0; R-1)	
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D-2; R-5)	0	PQ: (243-172; A: 237-178, Feb. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D-1; R-8)	3 (D-0; R-3)	PQ: (248-166; A: 249-163, Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (D-4; R-9)	8 (D-3; R-5)	PQ: (247-170; A: 248-170, Mar. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental appropriations	37 (D-8; R-29)	1 (not submitted) (D-1; R-0)	
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D-2; R-12)	4 (1-D not submitted) (D-2; R-2)	

Note.—Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

H. RES. 133

An amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. Goss:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States for the fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998. Following any general debate time remaining as provided for in H. Res. 131, the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion."

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the President has presented his economic plan to the country, the Congress has gone out into the country to

discuss and listen and debate that plan. Over and over again we hear that what the majority of the Americans want is more spending cuts first before we look at tax increases.

In order to do that, regardless of which budget resolution we adopt today, we have to have process reform. The single most important process reform that we must have is a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

I went to the Rules Committee yesterday to present as an amendment to any budget resolution that would be adopted the Barton-Tauzin balanced budget tax limitation amendment. The amendment was voted on in the House last summer and got 200 votes. It has bipartisan support. It has been endorsed yesterday by the entire Republican conference, all 175 members. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN], is my chief Democratic cosponsor, and we have over 25 Democratic cosponsors.

The Rules Committee waived all points of order on all amendments and all alternatives today, but they refused to let the Barton-Tauzin balanced budget amendment come to the floor to

be adopted as an amendment to any of these budget resolutions. It does not matter what budget resolution we pass today, until we have process reform with real discipline, the resolutions are not worth the paper they are printed on.

I urge a "no" vote so that we can go back to the Rules Committee and make the Barton-Tauzin amendment in order. We have to have a balanced budget amendment. We have to have it in this Congress. We need a chance to do it today. The Rules Committee said no. We should reject this rule to give us another opportunity.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats' tax increases are going to hurt American families. The Democrats' tax increases are going to hurt American employers. But tragically these tax increases will not reduce the deficit. Tax increases never reduce the deficit, and there are a lot of reasons for that.

One important reason is that people actually do behave differently when they are taxed more. This is something

that the economic models that are used by the Budget Committee completely disregard. But the fact is when people's maximum marginal tax rates go up by 37 percent, as is the case in this proposal, they are going to get into tax shelters, they are going to get into municipal bonds, and the Federal Government will not get a nickel from those investments. They are going to defer the realization of their income, and yes, they may even do less work, earn less money, and some may even retire from the work force altogether.

Another reason why raising taxes will not decrease the deficit is that increased taxes hurt the economy so badly that they cost jobs loss and they reduce the income that working people make, so that even when the tax rates go up the tax revenues do not.

The fact is that the rich, whom many of these taxes are aimed at, and the corporations, whom many of these taxes are aimed at, are also known as investors and employers, and the constriction of the economy that is going to be caused by these tax increases will reduce revenues.

Finally, even if every nickel of projected tax revenues came into the Federal Treasury, we still would not use them to reduce the deficit, because as we know too well, whenever Congress has gotten extra revenues from tax increases it has spent every nickel and then some. This is the history of 1982, of 1986, of Gramm-Rudman I, of Gramm-Rudman II. There is no reason to believe that will be different this time.

Vote for the Kasich substitute and against the Democrats' proposal.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. President, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD].

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and this budget resolution. I just concluded over 20 town meetings in my district, 6 meetings on the budget alone, trying to help our people understand the problems associated with the hard choices we must make on this issue. People would stand up in those meetings and voice their concerns about some part of the budget. Program services cuts, tax increases, sometimes expressing anger over their Government letting this country get to \$4 trillion in debt. But inevitably those same people would come up to me at the end of the meeting and say:

Congressman, we know the choices are tough, but we can tolerate this debt no longer. Change the direction and turn this country around from the accumulation of more deficits. We know that when the executive branch has told us we never have to pay for anything, that is wrong. And when the legislative branch tells us we never have to do without anything, that's equally wrong. Stop the blaming. Yes, we know that President Reagan doubled the defense budget and cut the taxes of the wealthiest people in this

country. We also know that Democrats have opposed the line-item veto to find a mechanism to get the unnecessary and nonpriority spending out of the budget. And we know that all of you let the special interests too greatly affect your decisions. We know that it's not always possible to anticipate an S&L bailout, or a Persian Gulf war, or a flat economy, all of which contribute to the deficit, but Congressman, we also know that if you people choose to work together, you can change the direction of this country and this deficit. Do it.

Mr. Speaker, I support the President's budget because it is the most realistic approach to resolving the deficit crisis facing our country. It recognizes that almost every American will be called upon to help his country. It does not offer an easy course promising no pain, or only pain for those who are in a different economic class than we are. It challenges the wealthiest to pay a fairer share in support of the plight of the middle class in this country and it challenges the middle class to think of the poorest among us.

This debate, sir, is not about Bill Clinton. It is about our children, their nutrition, their health care, their education, their future. This debate is not about Congress, it is about our country. Its future. Our future. This debate is about establishing accountability again by being honest with the people, admitting that some things have to be paid for now and that some nonpriority things have to go now. Years from this moment the history books will look us squarely in the eye and they will record this decision for posterity. Will they say that we found the courage to make the hardest choice in the most difficult of times or will they say that we had not the courage. That we settled for the easy course once again, because we cared more about winning the political battle than we cared about winning the future for our children. In my judgment, the President's budget gives us the best opportunity to win that future.

□ 1210

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the author of the freeze amendment. We cannot hold him responsible for the weather in Washington; this is the budget freeze.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I love these impassioned speeches that we just hear from the other side about how we have got to sacrifice and we have to be honest with the American people and that we have to help their country.

We brought a budget alternative to the Committee on Rules yesterday that would not raise America's taxes but would cut Government spending. It would pinch some toes, but it would not cause economic chaos, and they say, "You cannot get there without tax increases."

Well, America, there is a list of \$1.1 trillion in spending cuts that could be made that will get us to a balanced budget in 5 to 6 years without any tax increase.

We had the largest tax increase, or one of them, 2 years ago, and they said that would get us to a balanced budget. What did it do? It led to a major recession, and they said it was going to be used for deficit reduction, and for every \$1 in new taxes, they spent \$2.70. It did not amount to much in deficit reduction, but it did feather a lot of their political nests.

But they will tell you that we have got to raise your taxes, and get this, folks, \$402 billion, \$325.5 billion in tax increases and the rest in fees and other things they are calling spending cuts, \$402 billion in new taxes.

And get this: That is more than double the largest tax increase in history, yet they will tell you that is going to solve our economic problems. What it is going to do is put more taxes on the backs of businesses, and then those businesses who have to pass that on to the consumer are going to do so. It is going to price them out of competition. We are going to lose market share around the world to our competitors, and jobs will be driven out of this country.

Economists are telling us that the Clinton proposal will cost 1.4 million jobs over the next 5 years. All of their spending cuts are in the fourth and fifth years. All the tax increases and new spending is on the front end. We are going to have two Congresses elected between now and when the spending cuts take place. Do you think they will really take place? Not on your life.

They are going to raise your taxes and spend the money. We will never see the spending cuts.

So how do we get to a balanced budget? How do we save our kids and the future of this country? We do it by making the hard choices, by cutting spending.

What my budget does is it caps the growth of spending at no more than 2 percent a year, and we get there by changing, out of this \$1.1 trillion, we get there by taking \$848 billion out of these spending increases to get to the balanced budget. Sure, we are going to have to make the hard choices, but we do not have to take all of these spending cuts.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No. I do not have the time. I am sorry.

We only have to take \$848 billion out of this.

But what do they want to do? They want to convince you and the American people that the only way there is going to be any solution to this problem and the only way we are going to get there is by the pain of more taxes and the pain of more taxes to the tune

of more than double the largest tax increase in history.

It is going to put people out of work, drive companies out of this country, offshore into Taiwan and elsewhere, and it is going to hurt the economy dramatically. They are going to do irreparable damage to this economy with those tax increases.

We can cut the spending. The first thing we ought to be doing is taking a meat cleaver to the spending.

Ten years ago we brought in \$500 billion in taxes. Today it is \$1.2 trillion. We have almost tripled the tax revenues, yet they are still \$400 billion short.

The problem is not that we do not have enough money. The problem is they are spending too much.

And now their President wants to load another \$402 billion onto your backs.

The answer, if we are going to have shared pain, is not more taxes. The answer is to make hard choices, prioritize spending, cut out a lot of this stuff, and get to a balanced budget, not on the backs of the American people with more taxes, but by spending cuts. That is the answer.

If you look at this chart, you will see that, based upon current revenue projections by CBO, we will be at a balanced budget with a 2-percent solution by right at the turn of the century. If we use their plan, make no mistake about it, in 5 years you will be saddled with these taxes, and the budget will not be balanced. It will be worse. We will be in a bigger deficit hole, and we will have much more unemployment, and for each 1 percent of unemployment, it costs the Treasury and you, the taxpayer, \$42 billion, \$42 billion, and that is just another one of the problems they are going to create by hurting the economy with higher and higher taxes.

I would just like to say to my colleagues that lest you believe what I am saying, look at what they are doing; lest you believe what I am saying, the first bill they are bringing before this body, spending bill, is \$19 billion, and it is almost all pork.

They will tell you that they are trying to cut spending and do the responsible thing. Let me just tell you what is in that bill: \$5 million for a beach parking garage in some Congressman's district, \$1 million for a cemetery in some Congressman's district, a movie theater, \$3.5 million, for historic preservation in some Congressman's district, \$4.5 million in gym replacement in some Congressman's district, \$3.25 million in a pool, swimming pool renovation, and yet they tell you they are doing the responsible thing.

Cut spending, America.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would like to say simply that the presentation which I just heard made by the gentleman from Indiana is, in my opinion, and I think it would be backed up by any credible analysis, almost completely and totally incorrect and, I presume, presented to this House for some motive other than simply trying to pass the amendment that he was talking about. I would observe, and I think it is very important to observe, the Committee on Rules permitted the ranking Republican member of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], to bring forward his proposal for how this budget should be treated as an alternative to the Democratic proposal, and also permitted the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Rules, to bring forward his proposal regarding the budget.

I am sorry, Mr. BURTON, that they did not let you bring yours forward, and all I can say is with regard to this long list you very dramatically dropped out here in front of the House, apparently the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] did not agree with you either, and apparently the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] did not either, because their amendments do not include what you showed the Members of this House.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYANT. And I would say to the gentleman the same thing he just said to me a moment ago when I asked him to yield: Mr. BURTON, I do not have the time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. You do. You are the only speaker on your side. Yield for just a moment.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, I stand before the House today—

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. You do not want to answer?

Mr. BRYANT. I would observe, Mr. BURTON, that you did not yield to me, and so I will not afford you the same courtesy. If you choose to stand before this House and present what, in my view, are totally incorrect inferences and totally incorrect assertions, I do not believe that you ought to be allowed to do so without having to defend it and then come forward and ask us to yield to you, and I will not yield to you for that reason.

□ 1220

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Clinton budget and of the Budget package of the Budget Committee of the House. I think it is indeed the first genuine and dramatic step forward in dealing with the economic holocaust that we suffered in the 1980's, when we added approximately \$2 trillion to the national debt, based upon budget proposals which came from two Presidents nominated by those on the Republican side of the aisle.

I suggest that it is time for us to step up to the plate and recognize our responsibilities, which are, number one, that we must deal with this budget problem in a way that eliminates deficits and also takes into consideration the absolute necessity to maintain economic growth.

This budget reduces deficit spending over the next 5 years by \$510 billion. It is a dramatic improvement in what we have been doing and it is a genuine step forward toward economic viability. It reduces deficits by more than the Republican package which is before us today.

It also limits discretionary spending to the same level that was enacted for 1993, that is for this fiscal year, during each of the next 5 years, and in my opinion that is also a dramatic step forward.

It cuts \$63 billion more in spending than even the President proposed to us.

It is a responsible package. It takes into consideration the need to protect economic growth and also to eliminate these deficits, and it is a courageous proposal on the part of President Clinton to come forward and tell the American people that he is not going to be another one of these no pain Presidents. We have had no pain Presidencies for 12 years, and now the pain facing the American people is greater than anything we could possibly have imagined.

I submit to you that a President who is willing to come forward and say we need to make cuts and we need to increase taxes in certain areas is a President with courage who deserves to be followed, and I call upon the Members of the House today to vote for this rule and to follow him.

These new taxes apply to wealthiest Americans who have reaped the benefits of 12 years of Republican rule, who have reaped the benefits of tax changes that have increased their share of the national wealth at the expense of everybody else.

It is not wrong to suggest that they might endure slight increases in the tax rates which they must face on April 15. It is not wrong of us to say that taxes are a part of the solution to a budget problem that is completely out of control.

I submit to you it would be wrong to turn down this package. I urge you to vote for the very responsible rule now pending before the House and to vote for the budget package which follows.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I just would like to call to the attention of my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, that I did not include the Burton freeze in my substitute simply

because my substitute goes even further. I would be putting spending back in if I did that.

But let me say this. That issue of the freeze is a legitimate issue that should be on this floor for legitimate debate by both sides.

There was a substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] which has a check-off of 10 percent of your income tax to go toward reducing this deficit.

Now, some people agree with it, some do not.

They are legitimate issues that should be debated on this floor, and to make those substitutes in order and to have free and open debate would be fair.

I think the gentleman's constituents in Texas would like it. I know mine would, and that is all that I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] was trying to make on that point.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas and for the edification of my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, that all of these cuts came from the Kasich plan and the Heritage Foundation. They are very real cuts. They are not imaginary.

The problem is the Democrats do not want to make the hard choices. They would much rather load taxes on the backs of the American people and spend the money, instead of making the hard choices on the cuts that are necessary.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BYRANT. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to observe that if indeed the cuts of the gentleman from Indiana are in the plan of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] or they are in the plan of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], that I cannot understand what the gentleman is complaining about. We are going to vote on what the gentleman proposed. If that is true, then the gentleman has no complaint.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if I might just reclaim my time, his freeze is not in any of the plans.

Mr. BRYANT. Why not?

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, because it is a different concept and that different concept ought to be debated, because some of us want to make such deeper cuts in specific items.

Mine, for instance, eliminates the superconducting super collider in the gentleman's State of Texas. The gentleman does not like that. Some other people do not like it.

Mine eliminates one-third of the cost of the space station. Some people do

not like that. He should have had his day in court.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, this past decade has been a decade of deficits, deficits created by a gridlocked National Government, a gridlock that resulted because of an unwillingness on the part of political leaders to address honestly those elements of our Federal budget which needed to be restrained if we were truly to eliminate the red ink.

For a decade we denied that in order to solve this monstrous problem, every item within the Federal budget needed to be placed on the table and cuts needed to be applied fairly throughout those accounts.

We denied the reality that in order to get rid of 200 or 300 billion dollars' worth of red ink that Pentagon spending needed to be dramatically curtailed.

We denied the reality that tough choices needed to be made within the domestic discretionary spending agenda and that at the very least a spending cap or a freeze needed to be achieved in that area to force programs to compete one against another so that lower priority programs would be cut and higher priority programs would be benefited.

We denied that entitlement spending needed to be part of a budget solution. Yet, health care costs and retirement costs and farm program costs and other mandatory program costs are really the dragon that is eating up so much of this Federal budget and causing a large share of our deficit spending.

We were afraid for a decade to admit that even with the deepest of cuts in the Pentagon and in domestic programs and in the entitlement areas, we would probably have to raise taxes to balance this budget.

The American people proved in 1992 that they were ready to hear the truth. In response, we can credit President Clinton for presenting an honest budget to the country, a budget that has changed the dynamic of the debate about Federal spending.

President Clinton did what his predecessors would not. He put everything on the table.

President Clinton suggested 150 specific program cuts.

President Clinton opened the door to Social Security cuts by suggesting that the wealthiest seniors pay some taxes on their Social Security income as a way of contributing to our deficit reduction goals.

President Clinton admitted that taxes had to be part of the mix. As a consequence this year for the first time in a decade we have had a relatively honest discussion of budget priorities and budget decisions as we approach a solution to this Nation's deficit problems.

The House Budget Committee did the President one better. In the course of their work, they added \$63 billion worth of spending cuts to the President's budget package. Effectively they have presented to us a budget that will call upon us to adhere to a 5 year spending freeze on discretionary spending. A spending freeze for 5 years is a tough proposition any way you look at it.

Further, they included additional entitlement cuts by limiting COLA's on certain retirement programs.

This is a tough budget. This is an honest budget. Those of us in the Democratic Party who led the call for additional cuts appreciate the cooperation we have received from the White House and from Chairman SABO in pursuing these additional savings.

As a result, we now have a budget that will help us move closer to the President's goal of reducing the Federal deficit by 50 percent over the next 4 years.

This time around we have an honest debate. This time around we have all the elements on the table.

□ 1230

For the first time in a decade American's and their leaders in Washington are finally facing the fact that there is no easy way to eliminate the deficit, that tough decisions are required. While this may be a tough vote for some Members of Congress, it is the right vote for the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a yes vote on the budget.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to praise the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for the excellent job that he has done in presenting and preparing a freeze resolution.

I have long felt that this is the only sensible way to move on the most difficult question this Congress faces, which is how to get under control the massive deficits in which the Government has been engaged for decades and will be for more.

I particularly appreciate the words of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] that this proposal deserves its day in court.

Mr. Speaker, this is the only proposal before the House that does either not increase fees or not increase taxes. We do not touch Social Security or comparable government retirement programs. We freeze the budget at 2 percent growth rate per year, and by the year 2000, Mr. Speaker, the budget would be in balance, and \$848 billion would have been saved.

I say to my colleagues, "If you're talking about fairness, fairness means all programs, but a very small number treated equally and feel the pain equally."

A few weeks ago I introduced H.R. 1099. It was based on two principles, and I suggest that we face up to those principles:

No. 1, that Congress should act like a true board of directors and set the broad target, but set it firmly; No. 2, the President should be held accountable for moving funds within that broad target.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has approached that. I have approached it. H.R. 1099 is before the Committee on Government Operations. The freeze type proposal in the nature of a substitute deserves a hearing in committee and on this floor. The Budget Act of 1974 in this regard is completely outdated.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for yielding this time to me, and, Mr. Speaker, I am obviously disappointed that this rule did not allow a variety of alternatives to come to the floor, one of which the Committee on Rules had before them that was an attempt to allow me to offer the 10-percent check-off debt buy-down amendment which would give the American people an opportunity for the first time to check off on their tax form money to buy down the national debt and, thereby, at the same time reduce the deficit because it forces the Government to match dollar for dollar every debt buy-down dollar with a dollar of spending cuts. This particular proposal not only balances the budget in 5 years, but in 15 years, worked optimally, according to CBO, this is something that actually wipes out the entire national debt.

Now whether my colleagues agree with that as a concept or whether they do not; maybe there are people in this body who just do not want the American people involved in the process, but at least it is something that deserves discussion on the floor. It was an entirely germane amendment. What I am told is that we were told at the Committee on Rules that we could not do this because it was not in the form of a substitute and they only allow substitutes. Well, that is not right.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1991, when we were debating the budget resolution for 1992, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] offered a perfecting amendment. He was given an opportunity because he is a Democrat to come to the floor with something other than a substitute. However, Mr. Speaker, when a Republican goes to the Committee on Rules, asks for a perfecting amendment, asks for a procedural amendment, Republicans are told, "No, you may only bring a substitute," and, if you are Mr. BURTON and bring a substitute, you are told, "No, you can't even have that."

Now, if my colleagues wonder why we think this place operates unfairly, just consider how the budget has been debated thus far. First of all, on the budget resolution they got 5½ hours of debate on the Democrat side. We got 4½ hours of debate. That is pretty unfair. They got their amendments; we do not get our amendments. They get their substitutes, and, as my colleagues know, we get only a couple of substitutes, but not what we ask for.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this rule is a travesty.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EVERETT].

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot today on how taxpayers must suffer. Share of pain we call it. I have not heard anything about how the Congress must share the pain with the public.

Yesterday in the Committee on Rules I asked to offer a simple amendment to the budget resolution. It would express the sense of Congress that Members should not receive an increase in pay if there is a budget deficit left by the preceding Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress talk a good game of deficit reduction, but in the end do they really care about the fiscal responsibility since there is no penalty? There is a perception in the public that they do not care.

Most American workers get paid according to their job performance, Mr. Speaker, and I ask, "Why should our work place be any different? Why shouldn't Members of Congress receive compensation on a pay-per-performance basis just like other Americans? If Congress cannot reduce the deficit in an effective way, then freeze the pay level."

We are public servants. We serve the public. If anything, we should face higher standards as public servants. There is a national perception that Members of this institution seem to have it backwards.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that before Congress can lead this Nation to face the difficult tasks before us that we must show the Nation we are willing to lead by example. The House should be given a chance to state its position on this concept. The amendment would help change the perception that Congress protects its own purse while taking from the taxpayers.

It is a fair amendment, Mr. Speaker, fair to the Members of Congress and fair to the taxpayer. It would penalize Congress if it did not perform, and it should have been allowed.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the President's investment plan. It is exactly what is

needed to restore this country to its rightful place as the leader in the international global marketplace through emphasis in education and basic research. This 5-year budget plan will increase funding for education by over \$38 billion. This is a solid boost which will arm our students with higher level curriculum, better trained teachers, better equipment, more books and an enhanced teaching capacity in all of our classrooms across America.

President Clinton has put forth a comprehensive plan. I give it vigorous support because it will enhance the lives of women all across this Nation.

Let us not forget that half of American jobs are held by women. A jobs program will help women.

Women have suffered disproportionately over the last decade from failure of the prior administrations to think in terms of investing in the human needs of our working population: education, job training, child care, health, and equal opportunity.

We now have a President who speaks and thinks in terms of investment in human infrastructure.

Today 62 percent of those in poverty are women. Clinton's plan will put thousands of women back to work. This is a direction and priority that has been missing for the last decade.

Head Start for a million more children means jobs for tens of thousands of women. Providing high quality educational programs for these young children will not only employ thousands of women in the Head Start Program, but it will enable thousands more of the mothers of these children to get into jobs and job training.

Of all families who live in poverty, 51 percent are headed by women; 4.5 million women who work, live in poverty despite their jobs. Every time that our program lifts these women out of poverty into better paying jobs, it is a step up in the effort at deficit reduction.

Every child in Head Start opens up the possibility that the parent or parents have a better chance too to tool up their skills and seek a better job to work their way out of poverty. The dividends from our investment in Head Start are enormous.

It is this kind of investment plan seen throughout the Clinton program that promises the best hope for the future in terms of economic recovery and family stability.

Likewise, full funding of WIC for poor women, infants and children will save lives and lower the cost of health care among these most vulnerable and at-risk persons in our society. Every child this program captures means dollars in savings in the future. It is a long-term investment in our future which will pay dividends from the day it feeds a hungry child.

Earned income tax credit will stimulate low-wage earners earning under

\$30,000 to stay on the job to receive this credit. Many, if not a majority of these families who will be helped, consist of women wage earners. As they work their way out of poverty they will be reducing the deficit.

Child care support is included in the Clinton plan through the block grant program. If I have any grief about what is missing in the Clinton program it is that it does not provide enough in child care support funding. Women need good, high-quality child care programs. Women with young children make up a good percentage of the work force. They need quality programs where they can leave their children with confidence that they will be receiving a good educational program, as good, if not better, than Head Start. America does not have a nanny problem. Most women cannot afford such a luxury. Women need affordable child care programs available at the workplace, at their colleges, close to their homes and in their communities.

Education funding like chapter I, Job Corps centers, summer jobs for teenagers, job training programs, and others included in the President's plan will help young women move toward their first job better prepared and more highly trained.

To protect them in their jobs, to assure their right to advance without discrimination and harassment, the Clinton plan also provides for additional enforcement in the civil rights of workers, in particular the minorities and women.

Women must be assured access to jobs in this renewed, revitalized America—whether it is infrastructure jobs, small business investment loans to start a new business, or promotions into positions of management.

The President's plan is preserved in tact in this House budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 64. It is good for the economy, it reduces the deficit, it raises taxes and cuts spending on an equal ratio of 1 to 1, it will rebuild lives, create jobs, and give hope to millions that finally we have a President who cares about people and indeed puts them first.

I urge a "yes" vote for this resolution because it is good for America and more importantly because it is good for women, and it is the best beginning we have had in 12 years.

□ 1240

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from the midwest coast of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I believe, contrary to the impression we may have been giving for the past few hours to people watching at home, there are many things upon which we can all agree here today.

We all want America to remain the strongest country in the world, both

militarily and economically. We want our children to grow up healthy, well-educated, drug free and prosperous. And we want to reduce the burgeoning Federal deficit.

Make no mistake. We don't like it. We don't like having to say, over and over, that Federal Government spending must be contained, that waste must be eliminated, that the bloated bureaucracy must be deflated and that all programs must be examined with an eye toward cutting. We don't like to argue, over and over again, that we need a balanced budget amendment and a line-item veto.

No, it would be much easier to just keep piling money on every program year after year, regardless of effectiveness or continued need. It is far easier to spend money than it is to save money. It is much more pleasant to create programs than it is to cut programs.

In short, it is much easier to give than it is to take away.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all of us would like our President to succeed. But this budget will inflict real and long-term pain on average Americans in many ways.

But perhaps the most important aspect of the President's plan is that the taxes that he has proposed will come immediately, while deficit reduction remains a vague promise and a dim light at the end of the tunnel.

The President's budget raises taxes on Social Security recipients, cuts Medicare reimbursements and imposes a brutally regressive energy tax on everyone, regardless of income.

Americans have said they would pay more taxes to reduce the deficit. They have said they are willing to sacrifice. But they want results. And the fact is that the new tax money which is proposed, tragically, will not go toward reducing the deficit. It will go toward new spending.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

The question is on the decision of the Committee on Rules not to allow certain amendments to come before this body. I am disappointed that seven Members of the Committee on Rules can dictate what Members of the U.S. Congress will even be allowed to vote on.

We have heard a lot of talk about whether or not we want to balance the budget. During the election campaign, politicians proclaimed that "the Federal Government ought to live within its means" and led voters to believe that they could stop overspending.

My proposal to the Rules Committee, in a request to allow this Chamber to vote on the only balanced budget resolution before it, was denied. This reso-

lution would have frozen wages of not only Government employees, but legislators. It would have limited the growth of Government in the early years from a freeze to a 6.5-percent increase. It would have cut the fat out of much wasteful Government spending. It would have cut \$1 trillion out of Government spending over the next 5 years. Eliminating Government overspending would result in interest savings alone of \$112 billion. The proposal included budget cuts supported by the Heritage Foundation, the Cato Institute, Bush administration, and Clinton administration.

As we look at this 55-page document that Jon Gauthier of my staff and I put together, it is important to put our actions where our mouth and our political rhetoric is. Government ought to have the kind of restraint on spending that American families must have in order to balance their checkbooks.

Congress agrees that the Federal deficit is not fair to future generations. Congress should not only be allowed to vote on a balanced budget, in fairness to taxpayers, it ought to be required.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER].

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

We have been hearing a lot of claims about what this budget of Mr. Clinton's will do. We have been told we cannot tolerate this debt, that we must eliminate the deficit, and that this budget reduces debt. I wish it were true.

□ 1250

If it were, I could support it. But under Mr. Clinton's own numbers, under his own predictions, this budget is going to in 4 years increase the debt of America by \$916 billion. That is in one term \$183 billion more than the first Reagan term. In one term it is \$238 billion more in deficit than under the Reagan second term.

In 4 or 5 years under this program, welfare becomes the third largest item in the budget, larger than defense.

Mr. Speaker, this is a budget-busting proposal to move moneys from defense to welfare, and it ought to be defeated.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for consideration of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994. The rule makes in order three alternatives to the Budget Committee's recommendation and allows us to debate the flaws and virtues of each before the American public.

The debate will be about differences of opinion in how we achieve a common goal of reduced deficits, a healthy economy, and meeting the needs of our people. We are not going to quibble over details. The debate today will lay

out the basic philosophies of our two major parties and highlight the differences within each party.

Two Republican proposals and two Democratic proposals will be considered. I don't agree with everything in any of them. Everyone who listens to the debate today and everyone voting in this Chamber will find merits in each bill—and problems in the details of all of them. Democracy is a process of principled compromise. In looking at the four proposals that will be debated today, the strongest package—the one that I believe will prevail in the debate—is the budget crafted by the House Budget Committee. It cuts spending deeper than the President requested. It produces \$510 billion in deficit reduction over 5 years. It is based on careful assumptions about revenues and spending. It includes incentives for business to invest in the future growth of our economy. It calls for tough decisions on spending priorities and entitlement programs.

I commend the efforts of my Republican colleagues Mr. KASICH and Mr. SOLOMON and my Democratic colleague Mr. MFUME, as well as Budget Committee Chairman SABO. I ask all my colleagues to support the rule so we can move forward with this debate.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the author of the freeze.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just say to my colleagues who may be off the floor, or those who are here on the floor, that we will be having a vote on the previous question. Since we were not able in the Committee on Rules to get our 2-percent-plus freeze brought to the floor for a vote, the only vote we will be able to have on whether or not Members agree with that, will be on the previous question in just a few minutes.

Let me just say to my colleagues, if you do not want to vote for the Democrat \$402 billion tax increase, if you would rather approach this from the freeze-plus-2-percent-and-cut-spending approach, then vote for our position on the previous question when it comes up in just a few minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are at about the end of this debate, and I would like to just make a few wrap-up remarks in my remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think that it is important that our colleagues understand that we are not going to be allowed to consider under what is in fact a restrictive rule—and it is not the most restrictive rule, but it is a restrictive rule—we are not going to be able to consider the Michel amendment to protect against extraneous matters being tacked onto the budget. There is certainly not going to be any consider-

ation of the budget freeze proposals we have heard so much about in the last hour. There is not going to be any consideration of the approach of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] to limit the growth of Government spending, and that is something we have had on the floor in past years.

We will not get a chance to fully debate the idea of a national taxpayer checkoff, which has been kicked around quite a while. It has been in the campaign, has been on the floor, is back again, and it is something I think is worthy of debate, and I know many Members would like to have the opportunity to vote on it. It would at least ensure that some of the tax dollars we are talking about would go toward reducing the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on. I think this is probably going to be the No. 1 task of this Congress. The fact we are not going to have a chance to debate and vote on those issues somehow seems to me wrong placed.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out we have an automatic debt ceiling extender in this budget resolution, and it means that ceiling is going to go up. I suppose when it gets up over \$4 trillion, people's eyes begin to close about that. But the fact is that is serious and it is just going to happen sort of automatically.

Mr. Speaker, I have to urge defeat of the previous question, because that is a vote for Burton, for Walker, and Michel, and I would like to say it is a vote for getting a question of the debt ceiling on the floor too, but it is not.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have done a pretty good, and a pretty fair, job on this particular rule. As I mentioned at the outset, all Members will have before them, available for a vote, four comprehensive budget blueprints, two of them by Democrats, and two of them by Republicans, from which they may choose the best course for the Federal budget for the next 5 years. So I ask support of this rule. I think it is a good rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to rule 5(b)(1) of rule XV, the Chair may reduce to 5 minutes the time for any recorded votes that may be ordered on adoption of the resolution without intervening business.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 250, nays 172, not voting 8, as follows

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—250

Abercrombie	Gibbons	Murtha
Ackerman	Glickman	Nadler
Andrews (ME)	Gonzalez	Natcher
Andrews (NJ)	Gordon	Neal (MA)
Andrews (TX)	Green	Neal (NC)
Applegate	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Bacchus (FL)	Hall (OH)	Obey
Baessler	Hall (TX)	Oliver
Barcia	Hamburg	Ortiz
Barlow	Hamilton	Orton
Barrett (WI)	Harman	Owens
Becerra	Hastings	Pallone
Beilenson	Hayes	Parker
Berman	Hefner	Pastor
Bevill	Hilliard	Payne (NJ)
Bilbray	Hinchey	Payne (VA)
Bishop	Hoagland	Pelosi
Blackwell	Hochbrueckner	Penny
Bonior	Holden	Peterson (FL)
Borski	Hoyer	Peterson (MN)
Boucher	Hughes	Pickett
Brooks	Hutto	Pickle
Browder	Inslee	Pomeroy
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Poshard
Brown (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Rahall
Bryant	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Byrne	Johnston	Reed
Cantwell	Kanjorski	Reynolds
Cardin	Kaptur	Richardson
Carr	Kennedy	Roemer
Chapman	Kennelly	Rose
Clay	Kildee	Rostenkowski
Clayton	Kleczka	Rowland
Clement	Klein	Royal-Allard
Clyburn	Klink	Rush
Coleman	Kopetski	Sabo
Collins (IL)	Kreidler	Sanders
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Sangmeister
Condit	Lambert	Sarpalius
Conyers	Lancaster	Sawyer
Cooper	Lantos	Schenk
Coppersmith	LaRocco	Schroeder
Costello	Laughlin	Schumer
Coyne	Lehman	Scott
Cramer	Levin	Serrano
Danner	Lewis (GA)	Sharp
Darden	Lipinski	Shepherd
de la Garza	Lloyd	Sisisky
Deal	Long	Skaggs
DeFazio	Lowey	Skelton
DeLauro	Maloney	Slattery
Dellums	Mann	Slaughter
Derrick	Manton	Smith (IA)
Deutsch	Margolies-	Spratt
Dicks	Mezvinsky	Stark
Dingell	Markey	Stenholm
Dixon	Martinez	Stokes
Dooley	Matsui	Strickland
Durbin	Mazzoli	Studds
Edwards (CA)	McCloskey	Stupak
Edwards (TX)	McCurdy	Swett
Engel	McDermott	Swift
English (AZ)	McHale	Synar
English (OK)	McKinney	Tanner
Eshoo	McNulty	Tauzin
Evans	Meehan	Taylor (MS)
Fazio	Meek	Tejeda
Fields (LA)	Menendez	Thornton
Filner	Mfume	Thurman
Fingerhut	Miller (CA)	Torres
Flake	Mineta	Torricelli
Foglietta	Minge	Towns
Frank (MA)	Mink	Trafigant
Frost	Moakley	Tucker
Furse	Mollohan	Unsoeld
Gejdenson	Montgomery	Valentine
Gephardt	Moran	Velazquez
Geren	Murphy	Vento

Visclosky
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman

Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise

Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 251, noes 172, not voting 7, as follows:

NAYS—172

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman

NOT VOTING—8

Brewster
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)

□ 1315

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Washington for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Mr. HORN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

[Roll No. 78]

AYES—251

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman

Browder
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)

NOES—172

Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinar
Moorhead

NOT VOTING—7

Henry
McDade
Quillen

□ 1324

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Washington for, with Mr. Quillen against.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). Without objection, a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the House agreed to House Resolution 133.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. BEILENSEN
Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] to lay on the table the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] to reconsider the vote on House Resolution 133.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 250, noes 172, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

AYES—250

Abercrombie	Filner	McCurdy
Ackerman	Fingerhut	McDermott
Andrews (ME)	Foglietta	McHale
Andrews (NJ)	Ford (MI)	McKinney
Andrews (TX)	Frank (MA)	McNulty
Applegate	Frost	Meehan
Bacchus (FL)	Furse	Meek
Baesler	Gedjenson	Menendez
Barcia	Gephardt	Mfume
Barlow	Geren	Miller (CA)
Barrett (WI)	Gibbons	Mineta
Becerra	Glickman	Minge
Beilenson	Gonzalez	Mink
Berman	Gordon	Moakley
Bevill	Green	Mollohan
Bilbray	Gutierrez	Montgomery
Bishop	Hall (OH)	Moran
Blackwell	Hall (TX)	Murphy
Bonior	Hamilton	Murtha
Borski	Harman	Nadler
Boucher	Hastings	Natcher
Brewster	Hayes	Neal (MA)
Brooks	Hefner	Neal (NC)
Browder	Hilliard	Oberstar
Brown (CA)	Hoagland	Obey
Brown (FL)	Hochbrueckner	Oliver
Brown (OH)	Holden	Ortiz
Bryant	Hoyer	Orton
Byrne	Hughes	Owens
Cantwell	Hutto	Pallone
Cardin	Inslee	Parker
Carr	Jacobs	Pastor
Chapman	Jefferson	Payne (NJ)
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Payne (VA)
Clayton	Johnson (SD)	Pelosi
Clement	Johnson, E. B.	Penny
Clyburn	Johnston	Peterson (FL)
Coleman	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
Collins (IL)	Kaptur	Pickett
Collins (MI)	Kennedy	Pickle
Condit	Kennelly	Pomeroy
Conyers	Kildee	Poshard
Cooper	Kleczka	Price (NC)
Coppersmith	Klein	Rahall
Costello	Klink	Rangel
Coyne	Kopetski	Reed
Cramer	Kreidler	Reynolds
Danner	LaFalce	Richardson
Darden	Lambert	Roemer
de la Garza	Lancaster	Rose
Deal	Lantos	Rostenkowski
DeFazio	LaRocco	Rowland
DeLauro	Laughlin	Roybal-Allard
Dellums	Lehman	Rush
Derrick	Levin	Sabo
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Dicks	Lipinski	Sangmeister
Dingell	Lloyd	Sarpalius
Dixon	Long	Sawyer
Dooley	Lowey	Schenk
Durbin	Maloney	Schroeder
Edwards (CA)	Mann	Schumer
Edwards (TX)	Manton	Scott
Engel	Margolies-	Serrano
English (AZ)	Mezvinsky	Sharp
English (OK)	Markey	Shepherd
Eshoo	Martinez	Sisisky
Evans	Matsui	Skaggs
Fazio	Mazzoli	Skelton
Fields (LA)	McCloskey	Slaterry

Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin

Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky

Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—172

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Flake
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman

Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Talent
Livingston
Machley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinar
Moorhead

Morella
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Crane
Ford (TN)
Hamburg

NOT VOTING—8

Quillen
Washington

□ 1342

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Washington for, with Mr. Quillen against.

So the motion to table was agreed to.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 60, nays 360, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

AYES—60

Allard	Dunn	Johnson, Sam
Armey	Everett	King
Baker (CA)	Ewing	Kingston
Baker (LA)	Fields (TX)	Livingston
Ballenger	Fowler	McCandless
Bartlett	Franks (CT)	McKeon
Bentley	Gekas	Mica
Blute	Gingrich	Molinar
Boehner	Goodling	Paxon
Bonilla	Greenwood	Pombo
Bunning	Hancock	Roberts
Burton	Hansen	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Hefley	Spence
Callahan	Herger	Stump
Collins (GA)	Hobson	Taylor (NC)
Cox	Hoekstra	Thomas (WY)
Crane	Hoke	Torkildsen
Doolittle	Horn	Vucanovich
Dornan	Hunter	Walsh
Duncan	Hyde	Young (AK)

NOES—360

Abercrombie	Chapman	Eshoo
Ackerman	Clay	Evans
Andrews (ME)	Clayton	Fawell
Andrews (NJ)	Clement	Fazio
Andrews (TX)	Clinger	Fields (LA)
Applegate	Clyburn	Filner
Archer	Coble	Fingerhut
Bacchus (FL)	Coleman	Fish
Bachus (AL)	Collins (IL)	Flake
Baesler	Collins (MI)	Foglietta
Barcia	Combest	Ford (MI)
Barlow	Condit	Frank (MA)
Barrett (NE)	Conyers	Franks (NJ)
Barrett (WI)	Cooper	Frost
Barton	Coppersmith	Furse
Bateman	Costello	Gallegly
Becerra	Coyne	Gallo
Beilenson	Cramer	Gedjenson
Bereuter	Crapo	Gephardt
Bevill	Cunningham	Geren
Bilbray	Danner	Gibbons
Bilirakis	Darden	Gilchrist
Bishop	de la Garza	Gillmor
Blackwell	Deal	Gilman
Bliley	DeFazio	Glickman
Boehert	DeLauro	Gonzalez
Bonior	DeLay	Goodlatte
Borski	Dellums	Gordon
Boucher	Derrick	Goss
Brewster	Deutsch	Grams
Brooks	Diaz-Balart	Grandy
Browder	Dickey	Green
Brown (CA)	Dicks	Gunderson
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Gutierrez
Brown (OH)	Dixon	Hall (OH)
Bryant	Dooley	Hall (TX)
Byrne	Dreier	Hamilton
Calvert	Durbin	Harman
Camp	Edwards (CA)	Hastert
Canady	Edwards (TX)	Hastings
Cantwell	Emerson	Hayes
Cardin	Engel	Hefner
Carr	English (AZ)	Hilliard
Castle	English (OK)	Hoagland

Hochbrueckner	Meek	Schenk
Holden	Menendez	Schiff
Houghton	Meyers	Schroeder
Hoyer	Mfume	Schumer
Huffington	Michel	Scott
Hughes	Miller (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Hutchinson	Miller (FL)	Serrano
Hutto	Mineta	Sharp
Inglis	Minge	Shaw
Inhofe	Mink	Shays
Inslee	Moakley	Shepherd
Istook	Mollohan	Shuster
Jacobs	Montgomery	Sisisky
Jefferson	Moorhead	Skaggs
Johnson (CT)	Moran	Skeen
Johnson (GA)	Morella	Skelton
Johnson (SD)	Murphy	Slattery
Johnson, E. B.	Murtha	Slaughter
Kanjorski	Myers	Smith (IA)
Kasich	Nadler	Smith (MI)
Kennedy	Natcher	Smith (NJ)
Kennelly	Neal (MA)	Smith (OR)
Kildee	Neal (NC)	Smith (TX)
Kim	Nussle	Snowe
Kleczka	Oberstar	Solomon
Klein	Obey	Spratt
Klink	Oliver	Stark
Klug	Ortiz	Stearns
Knollenberg	Orton	Stenholm
Kolbe	Owens	Stokes
Kopetski	Oxley	Strickland
Kreidler	Packard	Studds
Kyl	Pallone	Stupak
LaFalce	Parker	Sundquist
Lambert	Pastor	Swett
Lancaster	Payne (NJ)	Swift
Lantos	Payne (VA)	Synar
LaRocco	Pelosi	Talent
Laughlin	Penny	Tanner
Lazio	Peterson (FL)	Tauzin
Leach	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (MS)
Lehman	Pickle	Tejeda
Levin	Pomeroy	Thomas (CA)
Levy	Porter	Thornton
Lewis (CA)	Poshard	Thurman
Lewis (FL)	Price (NC)	Torres
Lewis (GA)	Pryce (OH)	Torricelli
Lightfoot	Quinn	Towns
Linder	Rahall	Traficant
Lipinski	Ramstad	Tucker
Lloyd	Rangel	Unsoeld
Long	Ravenel	Upton
Lowey	Reed	Valentine
Machtley	Regula	Velazquez
Maloney	Reynolds	Vento
Mann	Richardson	Visclosky
Manton	Ridge	Volkmmer
Manzullo	Roemer	Walker
Margolies-	Rogers	Waters
Mezvinsky	Ros-Lehtinen	Watt
Markey	Rose	Waxman
Martinez	Rostenkowski	Weldon
Matsui	Roth	Wheat
Mazzoli	Roukema	Whitten
McCloskey	Rowland	Williams
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Wilson
McCrery	Royce	Wise
McCurdy	Rush	Wolf
McDade	Sabo	Woolsey
McDermott	Sanders	Wyden
McHale	Sangmeister	Wynn
McHugh	Santorum	Yates
McInnis	Sarpalius	Young (FL)
McKinney	Sawyer	Zeliff
McMillan	Saxton	Zimmer
McNulty	Schaefer	
Meehan		

NOT VOTING—10

Berman	Hinchey	Quillen
Ford (TN)	Johnston	Washington
Hamburg	Kaptur	
Henry	Pickett	

□ 1401

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). Pursuant to House Resolution 133 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 64.

□ 1401

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, with Mr. SERRANO in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on the prior legislative day, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 133, the concurrent resolution is considered as read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 64, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 64

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994.

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990).

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, and October 1, 1997:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994:	\$905,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:	\$970,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:	\$1,030,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:	\$1,086,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:	\$1,135,600,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994:	\$27,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:	\$36,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:	\$51,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:	\$66,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:	\$65,700,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994:	\$93,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:	\$104,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:	\$111,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:	\$116,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:	\$122,500,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994:	\$1,222,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:	\$1,288,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:	\$1,337,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:	\$1,393,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:	\$1,461,200,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994:	\$1,217,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:	\$1,276,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:	\$1,315,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:	\$1,355,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:	\$1,424,800,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994:	\$312,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:	\$306,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:	\$284,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:	\$269,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:	\$289,200,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994:	\$4,715,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:	\$5,076,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:	\$5,428,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:	\$5,776,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:	\$6,141,400,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, and October 1, 1997, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994:	
(A) New direct loan obligations,	\$21,400,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments,	\$148,000,000,000.
---	--------------------

Fiscal year 1995:	
(A) New direct loan obligations,	\$22,100,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments,	\$152,400,000,000.
---	--------------------

Fiscal year 1996:	
(A) New direct loan obligations,	\$32,400,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments,	\$145,500,000,000.
---	--------------------

Fiscal year 1997:	
(A) New direct loan obligations,	\$43,800,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments,	\$137,000,000,000.
---	--------------------

Fiscal year 1998:	
(A) New direct loan obligations,	\$45,500,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments,	\$137,400,000,000.
---	--------------------

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1994 through 1998 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1994:	
(A) New budget authority,	\$263,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays,	\$276,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations,	\$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,	\$0.
---	------

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments,	\$0.
---	------

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority,	\$262,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays,	\$271,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,	\$0.
---	------

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments,	\$0.
---	------

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority,	\$253,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays,	\$264,200,000,000.

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$5,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$5,300,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$4,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$4,000,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$5,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$5,000,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$10,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$10,800,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1994:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$30,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$32,300,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$30,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$32,600,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$31,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$32,700,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$31,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$32,600,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$32,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$33,100,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) Not later than May 13, 1993, the House committees named in subsections (b) through (n) of this section shall submit their

recommendations to the House Budget Committee. After receiving those recommendations, the House Budget Committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$258,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$396,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$1,067,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$1,918,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$2,187,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in an increase of outlays as follows: \$523,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$1,524,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$1,527,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$1,533,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$1,551,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(c) The House Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$186,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$470,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$782,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$1,119,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$1,383,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$2,012,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$3,231,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$4,117,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$5,103,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$5,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(d) The House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending, sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$220,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$266,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$482,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$704,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$726,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$141,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$164,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$273,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$373,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$406,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase revenues, as follows: \$63,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$65,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$68,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$70,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$73,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(e) The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays by \$66,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, and to reduce outlays as follows: \$93,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$1,309,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$3,044,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$3,564,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(f) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$4,343,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$7,493,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$13,047,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$17,133,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$21,347,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$137,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$236,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$663,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$621,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$650,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(g) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$2,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$7,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$12,000,000 in fiscal year 1996,

\$16,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$18,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(h) The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$0 in fiscal year 1994, \$0 in fiscal year 1995, \$111,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$115,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$119,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(i) The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$0 in fiscal year 1994, \$0 in fiscal year 1995, \$67,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$68,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$70,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(j) The House Committee on Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$137,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$201,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$339,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$406,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$414,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$137,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$236,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$663,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$621,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$650,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(k) The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$228,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$935,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$3,445,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$4,833,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$4,896,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$2,906,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$4,660,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$5,825,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$7,169,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$8,164,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(l) The House Committee on Public Works and Transportation shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$31,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$49,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$62,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$76,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$78,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(m) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$266,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$364,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$382,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$405,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$1,163,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(n) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit, as follows: by \$29,488,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, by \$41,319,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, by \$61,583,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, by \$81,484,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and by \$84,935,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(o) For purposes of this section, the term 'direct spending' means spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and new budget authority as defined in section 3(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 5. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

(a) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) from time to time the United States Government should sell assets; and

(2) the amounts realized from such assets sales will not recur on an annual basis and do not reduce the demand for credit.

(b) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—For purposes of points of order under sections 302, 303, 310, 311, 601(b), 602, and 605 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, the amounts realized from sales of assets (other than loan assets) shall not be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues under those sections.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "sale of an asset" shall have the same meaning as under section 250(c)(21) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990); and

(2) the term shall not include asset sales mandated by law before September 18, 1987, and routine, ongoing asset sales at levels consistent with agency operations in fiscal year 1986.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TAX REVENUES AND DEFICIT REDUCTION.

It is the sense of Congress that any legislation enacting tax increases called for in this budget resolution contain language providing that the net revenues generated by the legislation shall not be counted for the purpose of calculating the amount of any deficit increase called for in section 252(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendments are in order except the amendments printed in House Report 103-37, which shall be considered in the order printed in the report and by the named proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to amendment.

If more than one amendment in the nature of a substitute is adopted, only the last amendment adopted shall be considered as having been finally adopted and reported back to the House.

At the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be an additional period of general debate, which shall not exceed 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member on the Committee on the Budget.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 103-37.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE
OFFERED BY MR. KASICH

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. KASICH: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994.

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994, including

the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990).

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, and October 1, 1997:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$878,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: \$933,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$979,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,019,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,069,400,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$0.
Fiscal year 1995: \$0.
Fiscal year 1996: \$0.
Fiscal year 1997: \$0.
Fiscal year 1998: \$0.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$93,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: \$104,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$111,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$116,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$122,500,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$1,183,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: \$1,226,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$1,277,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,350,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,428,900,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$1,184,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: \$1,216,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$1,256,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,312,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,389,000,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$305,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: \$282,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$276,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$292,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$319,600,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$4,714,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: \$5,055,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$5,394,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$5,747,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$6,123,100,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, and October 1, 1997, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1994 through 1998 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$264,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$277,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$263,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$272,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$262,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$271,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$269,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$271,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$277,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$272,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(A) New budget authority, \$13,700,000,000

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, \$35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$36,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, \$35,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$35,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$35,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$37,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$37,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, \$37,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$37,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$13,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, \$13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, \$13,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, \$239,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$239,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, \$258,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$258,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, \$277,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$277,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$294,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$294,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, \$313,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$313,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$35,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, \$34,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$34,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$34,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$34,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, \$35,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$35,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.
(a) Not later than May 1, 1993, the House committees named in subsections (b) through (n) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the House Budget Committee. After receiving those recommenda-

tions, the House Budget Committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$2,849,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$3,012,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$2,444,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$2,511,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$2,473,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in an increase of outlays as follows: \$554,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$783,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$852,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$911,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$955,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(c) The House Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$900,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$2,010,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$1,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$50,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$80,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$920,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$2,360,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$3,980,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$5,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$6,680,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(d) The House Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending, sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$429,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$545,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$711,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$703,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$778,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$87,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$473,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$1,209,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$1,827,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$2,065,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(e) The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays by \$3,215,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, and to reduce outlays as follows: \$3,265,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$2,725,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$2,785,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$2,745,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(f) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$9,813,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$18,779,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$22,777,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$25,613,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$28,099,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(g) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$551,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$891,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$1,194,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$1,248,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$1,281,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(h) The House Committee on Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$12,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$45,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$108,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$186,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$254,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(i) The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as

follows: \$0 in fiscal year 1994, \$0 in fiscal year 1995, \$67,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$68,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$70,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(j) The House Committee on Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$160,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$170,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$189,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$190,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$190,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(k) The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$419,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$666,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$4,847,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$6,140,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$6,506,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$4,141,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$7,196,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$17,980,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$23,644,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$26,784,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(l) The House Committee on Public Works and Transportation shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$18,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$31,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$94,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$108,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$115,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(m) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$478,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, \$602,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$641,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$668,400,000 in fiscal year 1997, and \$1,438,100,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(n) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit, as follows: by \$8,875,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, by \$17,873,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, by \$25,196,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, by \$33,234,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and by \$42,688,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(o) For purposes of this section, the term 'direct spending' means spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and new budget authority as defined in section 3(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

At the end, insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that any increase in receipts from higher taxes on benefits should be dedicated to the OASDI trust funds as provided under current law; and any diversion of these receipts to other programs will serve only to undermine the integrity of the social security system whose receipts were taken off-budget as part of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain today, as we begin the final legs of the debate, that the choice really is very clear. The Democrats favor larger central

government. They think a large Federal Government is the answer. The Republican plan, Mr. Chairman, believes that empowering the individual and getting government off the individual's back is the answer with a smaller Federal Government. The Democrats believe in more taxes. The Republicans have no new taxes. We believe we should cut spending first. The Democrats believe that more government spending is the answer. The Republicans say no new government spending, a smaller Federal Government. The Democrats favor the same, tired, old government institutions. The Republicans stand for change. The Republicans stand for reform in a 84-page reform-oriented document. The Democrats, and my colleagues will not believe this one, they are the ones for gridlock. The Republicans went to the Committee on the Budget and offered 35 amendments to improve the Clinton package by reducing the taxes and substituting specific spending cuts. The Republicans, while trying to be constructive, were absolutely, totally and positively rejected by the majority side who favored gridlock in the House Committee on the Budget. The Democrats are the ones that are blocking the Clinton change program. The President came to the Hill and said he wanted to have more cuts and less spending, but his own party says they will not bear the traffic of reducing the size and scope of the Government. The Republicans, on the other hand, have put the specifics down on the table. We welcomed the Clinton change program. We welcomed the Clinton change agenda. It is unfortunate that he cannot get his own party to support him on that. The Democrats have the job-killer program. The Republicans have the job-creator program.

My colleagues, it all gets down to one simple thing; the choice really is clear. There is a clear choice here, not an echo. The Republicans are for less government, less taxes, less spending, less Federal interference as to a stated philosophy on the majority side that indicates that a larger Federal Government, a larger central government managing the affairs of the United States, is the answer. It did not work in New Jersey. They could not tax their way to prosperity. It will not work in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we would hope the Republican plan would be adopted. But if the Democrat plan is put into effect, and we believe it will have, unfortunately, a very negative impact on this economy, we will be glad to cross the aisle, and, in the spirit of bipartisanship, end gridlock and get them to accept the notion that reducing the Federal Government, being reform-oriented and believing in change is ultimately the answer for the United States of America.

I urge my colleagues to support the Republican Committee on the Budget

substitute to the big government, Democrat plan.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first, lest I forget later, I want to say, you've done a great job in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. SABO. The gentleman in the chair has been fair and courteous to all the Members in his usual way, and we thank him.

Let me also again express to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], an appreciation for his courtesies and all his hard work because he really has worked hard, and the members of his caucus and his staff have worked and, I think, represented the minority well in this process of dealing with the budget.

However, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated yesterday, there is only one thing wrong with all the hard work, and that is they are wrong on substance. The Republican program is not true. It is really sort of an austere version of Bush that got us into the current problems. It is the philosophy of government that, if it had prevailed over the decades, would have us still on gravel roads.

Plus they are driven by another very fundamental fear, a very fundamental fear that we might ask the most affluent in our society to pay some more to reduce the deficit.

□ 1410

We are asking for additional revenues in our package, 73 percent of them paid by individuals with incomes over \$100,000 a year, and, boy, that hurts Republicans. They do not like it.

Let me be clear about the Budget Committee resolution that is before us today. It moves forward the program and the vision of a new President who wants to lead this country into a new century of prosperity with jobs that pay decent salaries and an economy that is competitive in the world.

We do that by moving forward his investment program, by his program of streamlining Government to make sure that the Federal Government works effectively.

There are some things I hope my Republican colleagues are right on. I hope they can find all the Bush waste and mismanagement that they talk about. Clearly that will help us meet our budget targets.

But let us be clear about the Budget Committee resolution we have before us. It contains real deficit reduction, \$5 to \$10 billion over the 5 years, more than the Republican package. More important, in years 1997-98, as we project to the future, it is \$25 to \$30 billion of additional deficit reduction beyond the Republican plan.

But at the same time it still says we must invest in our kids, we must train

our workers, we must invest in the technology that will lead us into the 21st century. We must invest in our infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, we do have a unique opportunity today. We have the chance to end gridlock. We have the chance for Congress to move forward with the program of a new President with a new vision for America. I ask for an "aye" vote.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in response to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], I would say that we do not particularly admire his position, but we do admire the discipline of the Democrats on the Committee on the Budget. We offered, as our vice chairman pointed out, 30-plus specific recommendations. We offered an alternative that amounts to 428 billion dollars' worth of deficit reduction, more than the President's proposal plus the Democrats on the committee, without a tax increase, and we should not forget that.

We offered specifics, as we were challenged to do, but I want to focus on one specific.

Nothing has greater impact on the growth in Federal spending and the deficit than the issue of health care cost. Anyone who says they can significantly reduce the deficit in this country or eliminate the deficit without addressing health care costs is simply not facing reality.

Let me just mention a few things: Medicare and Medicaid in the budget in the current year will total \$226 billion. They did not exist 23 years ago. In 1994 the baseline budget in Medicare and Medicaid would be \$259 billion. That is a 15 percent increase over 1993. As you look out over the next 5 years, it increases at an average rate of 12 to 13 percent per year to total \$405 billion in 1998.

Medical care costs generally in this economy are increasing at four times the rate of inflation in this country. That is true for the private sector, and it is true for the Federal Government as well. They must be brought in line with the overall rate of inflation, both in the general economy and in the Federal budget as well.

President Clinton, no less, affirmed that principle in his State of the Union Message in which he said health care costs need to be brought in line with the general rate of inflation.

To achieve it, my colleagues, we need to save \$330 billion in 5 years out of Medicare and Medicaid against the baseline budget of \$1,651,000,000 on those two programs projected over the next 5 years.

That does not mean cutting it, it simply means moderating the rate of

increase by 20 percent. President Clinton in his proposal saves \$60 billion in health care costs, not counting the \$21 billion in additional taxes on Social Security that may be flowed into that program.

Our alternative, the Republican alternative, saves \$93 billion, reducing the rate of growth from the average of 12 percent to an average rate of growth of 10 percent. That is not enough, but it is a significant start.

We use most of the President's proposals on health care, and we add some that total some \$33 billion in additional savings.

Our savings, and admittedly it is difficult to do this in the absence of health care reform, but our proposed savings are designed to anticipate the probable focus that health care reform is going to make on defensive health care costs caused by excessive litigation, excess capacity, and excess overhead. Any serious health care reform proposal has got to address the cost drivers in the system, and we do this in including everything that the President included, and then some.

We basically go back to managed care in the Medicaid segment of the budget, which is likely to be a part of health care reform and proposes significant savings. Under Medicare we are making moderations in the rate of increase in payments in the first year to hospitals and physicians. That will not go on over the full period of time, but that is interrelated with the whole issue of their refocusing their efforts on the things that are driving up their health care costs: defense practices, excessive overhead, redundant capacity. We can urge them to do that through this process.

We are also trying to advocate consistency in copayments by beneficiaries, which is already very much a part of Medicare. But there are exceptions to that. We recognize that certain low income people cannot do it and we are willing to entertain a modification of that in that respect.

But on balance, it is good public policy for people to pay at least a percentage of the health care costs, because they are the ones that should be most concerned about it and can take action.

Finally, we make some adjustments among the very rich in the premiums that they pay to participate in Medicare. Those that we suggest make significant reductions in the deficit, but will not impose a serious burden on those individuals.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the final solution, but it is an important beginning on achieving some of the cost reductions interrelated with health care reform. I realize that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will say let us wait and deal with this under health care reform, but I would point out to them that there are dissenting views

published by certain members of the Committee on the Budget that state that they are disappointed that the Democratic plan did not address the issue of entitlement spending more than we do in their resolution.

I would suggest that the Republican alternative does exactly that, and, in the words of the President, that we can do better. I think the Kasich amendment does, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, before I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], let me just commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] on his interest in health care reform. While I do not agree with his copy requirements on certain services that he proposes in this budget, clearly he has focused on a very fundamental problem that we face, and I think everything the gentleman has said about the problems of escalating costs in Medicare and Medicaid are all compelling reasons why President Clinton's approach to having fundamental reform of health care is so incredibly important. Really a cornerstone of what we are doing here today is our expectation that we will have very comprehensive health care reform coming to this Congress from the President in May of this year.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] for his interest and work on that issue, because he is right. If we are going to handle the deficit in the long term we need to control health care costs. If our economy is to be competitive, we have to control health care costs. Plus equity demands that we deal with the access problem in our society.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

□ 1420

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I, at the outset, want to express my personal admiration for the very fine job done by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] in putting this budget together. It is a very difficult job, perhaps the most difficult chairmanship to manage in the House. I am very proud of the work that we have done and proud of his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican amendment which is before us today might fairly, I think, be labeled the "no-pain amendment."

We have had 12 years now of no-pain Presidents who promised us that we could make this country run without anybody having to pay for it, who promised us that we could continue cutting taxes for the wealthiest segments of our society and still continue to have a government that was meaningful in its ability to take this coun-

try forward down a path of progress and to protect our interests abroad.

I think it is very clear, in 1993, that those promises of no pain were false promises, that it was a mistake to promise that to the American people and that, unfortunately, the price which they paid is more pain today than we have ever, ever imagined we would have to suffer in terms of our budget deficits in 1993.

I think also that the Republican amendment is an amendment that dramatically underestimates the American people. Nobody wants to pay more taxes. Nobody wants to suffer budget cuts. But the American people understand that we have to pay for what we do. They understand that we cannot go down a road promising everything, that we cannot avoid having to pay for the benefits of having a strong government that provides roads, that provides a health care system, that provides an education system, that protects our international interests. They understand that.

Yet the Republican amendment one more time comes up here and suggests to all of us who are in this room and who are watching that somehow or another we can continue to step forward as Americans into the world and lead and accept our responsibilities without anybody having to bear any kind of discomfort. It is a false promise. And the American people, who are at a much higher level of understanding than the Republicans think, know this. Unfortunately, as one might expect, this no-pain amendment is also a no-gain amendment.

It provides less deficit reduction than is provided by the Democratic amendment on the floor today. In fact, it only provides, as I understand it, \$495 billion in deficit reduction over the next 5 years, whereas the Democratic proposal is \$510 billion in deficit reduction over the next 5 years.

If we want real deficit reduction, then vote for the Democratic budget; vote against the Republican alternative. And though it is characterized by its author as being highly specific, anyone who examines it closely will recognize that one-third, fully one-third of the savings that are claimed by this Republican alternative, cannot be found. They are unidentified. They are found in function 920, allocated in a general fashion so that no one knows exactly what they are.

Finally, the Republican proposal is not only the no-gain amendment, it is the no-investment amendment: No additional funds for Head Start, the one program which is unanimously recognized as having done an enormous amount toward raising the children of our least privileged Americans to a level that they can begin to compete and expect to have a future. In the Republican amendment, we do not invest more funds in Head Start.

No defense conversions. I wonder, do they argue to us that it is actually a savings not to invest money in defense conversion, not to invest money in Head Start? Surely, anyone with common sense would recognize it costs us more in the long run not to put money into those needed areas.

No new highway funds. No child immunization increases and no health care increases. Do they actually argue to us that we save money by not increasing the funds we are spending on immunizing children? Surely they would recognize that it costs us more in the long run not to increase funding in that area.

And no increases for education or job training. Do they promise the American people that it is a savings not to increase our investment in education? Surely that is the one area in which a failure to invest will cost us more in the long run.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Committee on the Budget majority has come forward with a budget this year that dramatically cuts spending and, in fact, adds \$63 billion in cuts above what the President has asked us to do, that recognizes the need to charge a tax structure which has been responsible for the movement of wealth to the upper class and away from working-class and middle-class Americans and instead begin to put the tax burden where it ought to be; that is, fairly borne by all segments of society, rather than just the middle class, and also recognizes the need to begin to invest in our future.

It is a prudent package. It is one that I am proud to stand here and advocate. I am proud of the work done by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] and members of the Democratic Committee on the Budget. I strongly urge Members today to vote against the Republican alternative and vote for a strong future for the American people.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that, again, the Democrats are up to their old tricks and bad estimates. Look in the area of allowances. My colleagues can see that we here are very specific in terms of what we do. COLA freeze for Federal civilian workers, repeal of Davis-Bacon, eliminate the successorship provisions in Federal contracts. They are very, very specific.

They can lump them any way they want to, but they are the ones that got the "F" on the specific test.

Furthermore, in terms of the area of administrative cost savings, Clinton has about 34, we got about 48. We go all the way down to object class 20, never even though of by anybody on the side over there that did not go with specifics.

Mr. Panetta himself has now, referring to Federal contracts and object class 20. So stop the distortions. They are inaccurate, along with the deficit numbers.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just quickly correct one thing that was said at the outset of this debate. The suggestion was made that there are more savings, there is more deficit reduction in the Democratic plan. Let us be very clear about that.

The CBO has scored the Clinton plan at \$362 billion. The CBO scored the additional Democratic cuts at \$63 billion, for a total of \$425 billion.

Our plan has \$429 billion, slightly more, but roughly equivalent.

Any statement to the contrary that there are more savings scored by CBO in the Democratic plan is not true. It is false. It is a misstatement. It is wrong. It is deceptive.

It is not more savings in the Democratic plan.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contributions.

Mr. Chairman, let's go back to square one and the fact everyone in this Congress hoped we could see an end to gridlock and achieve real deficit reduction and economic recovery.

In that regard, President Clinton galvanized public support for these goals with his State of the Union speech. Now, the question is, will the President's plan achieve these goals.

We still do not have access to all of the administration's budget details, they change almost daily and once again we are being asked to vote for a budget plan where snakes will come out of the budget box and bite the beleaguered taxpayer for years to come.

That is no way to conduct business but let us at least take a look at one part of the budget. Last night, the distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Committee pointed out in eloquent and in most pertinent fashion that one of our budgetary goals should be fairness. He was referring to agriculture.

Simply put, the Clinton budget plan is not fair to rural and small town America and to our farmers and ranchers. Yes, we in agriculture are more than willing to self sacrifice, that is the point. As Chairman DE LA GARZA pointed out, since 1981, the Committee on Agriculture has cut \$57 billion from budget authority. The Budget Act of 1990 cut farm program spending by 20

percent. Contrary to public perception and vocal critics, only farm program spending has declined since 1985, an average of 9 percent per year.

Yet, we are singled out for \$8.7 billion in budget cuts on top of 4 years of budget cuts. We have had our fingers and toes on the chopping block. With President Clinton's cleaver, we are talking about arms and legs.

This budget vote is not only a vote on the budget but a vote for program policy and who gets represented and who does not. The agricultural share of Department of Agriculture funding is now approximately 32 percent. What's that you say, farm related programs only comprise 32 percent within the Department of Agriculture? That is right and under the Clinton budget that figure will go down to 17 percent at the end of 4 years. This budget dismantles the USDA with little or no debate.

And, what does it do to farmers? Our Republican staff of the House Agriculture Committee estimates the cost of the energy tax close to \$2,000 a year for your typical Kansas wheat farm, more in the Pacific Northwest, equally burdensome in the Midwest, California and west Texas; it hits all commodities—not to mention senior citizens in rural area, moving essential goods to rural areas requires more energy.

And, what do we get in return for discriminatory cuts, means testing the farm program and hit hard with an energy tax? The tax pain does not result in any real deficit gain. Thirty-one of the so-called spending cuts are actually user fees that citizens will pay. The ratio of spending cuts to tax increases is completely out of whack and changes daily. The so-called stimulus package is a collection of 75 appropriations that were labeled dogs, cats and pork in the last session and have somehow been magically transformed into essential investment this session. I believe latest Congressional Budget Office estimate is that we are talking about \$93,000 per job creation.

And, to make matters worse, the increased tax revenue from the pocketbooks of hard-pressed taxpayers will not go to reduce the deficit but to pay for the laundry list of social welfare programs the President has proposed.

But, back to the farm. It would be one thing if farm prices were even close to the cost of production. They are not. Large crops, a weak global economy and an uncertain export picture due in part to the Russian crisis have caused sudden and deep price declines at the country elevator.

Mr. Chairman, the fact this budget is being presented during National Agriculture Week is a paradox of enormous irony. With this budget plan the President is stepping on the gas for more spending while jamming on the brakes with punitive taxes. The result is we will end up in the ditch. In farm coun-

try, this budget is a blueprint for disaster.

Please, my colleagues, let us not go down this impossible trail. The proposals for a spending freeze still make sense and still would result in real deficit reduction. The Kasich budget represents a better alternative. That is a paved road we can all travel and achieve the goals we all want to see accomplished.

□ 1430

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE], a member of the committee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, our debate today is about real choices, choices to move the country forward and build sustainable growth, choices to slash the mountain of debt built up over the last 12 years, choices both to spend less and to spend what we do spend more intelligently, to restore fairness to our Tax Code, to invest our scarce resources in educating and training our people, building our transportation and communications networks, expanding incentives for new research, business development, and job creation.

The President spelled it out dramatically in his economic plan. "Continuing the failed policies of the past 12 years is a choice without a future," he said. "To restore our Nation's economic vitality and reclaim our vision of America we must change course and we must do it now."

We are offered today four alternative budgets, four choices about how to reach a better future. I want to focus my remaining remarks on the proposal now before us, comparing it to the President's plan as reported by the House Committee on the Budget.

Let me begin, though, by commending the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] for rejecting calls from within their party to sit back and promote stalemate and continue the partisan bickering we have seen over the past 12 years. They have put together a comprehensive package that is worthy of debate, but in my opinion it does fall severely short on several grounds.

The Kasich budget, first of all, has less real deficit reduction, to be specific, \$15 billion less in deficit reduction, than the committee resolution. The Kasich budget has no growth incentives, no investment dollars, higher deficits, and more Government borrowing. Those are not the ingredients for a bright economic future.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] claims that his budget plan is the most specific plan offered today. He also claims CBO scoring of his plan. However, CBO was never asked to score this proposal. With regard to the specifics, what he really means is that he

plagiarized most of Clinton's specific cuts and then went to the CBO options book and pilfered a few more. Most of the Kasich specifics, in fact, are Clinton specifics or CBO specifics. Fully 80 percent of the real savings in this budget are borrowed from the President or from CBO. Since his budget calls for more borrowing, perhaps it is not surprising that the budget itself has been borrowed!

Let us look at the specifics, those that were not taken from the President or CBO. There are fully \$145 billion in this budget in unallocated savings. Since about 50 percent of what he likes to call these overhead costs occur in DOD, presumably he is hiding up to \$73 billion in additional defense cuts here. However, it is confusing, because the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] claims that he will limit the defense hit to 10 percent or \$14 billion of this unallocated pot of money. If so, the remaining \$130 billion would have to come out of domestic discretionary spending. That would be a massive, unspecified cut in transportation, health research, education, training, new technologies, and law enforcement. Can he really, seriously believe in that kind of choice?

Another element of the choice is mandates, mandating, for example, that the States impose managed care on Medicaid and then removing \$10 billion in funding to the States. Members will want to take special note of this. This is another Federal mandate with less money for the States. If our Governors and local officials hate unfunded mandates, how do we think they are going to feel about defunded mandates?

Then the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] proposes something called WIC Plus, to put all nutrition funds into a block grant and cut funding by \$8.3 billion. What he really ought to call it is WIC Lite.

The Bush recession, the anemic recovery, mean that more Americans than ever, nearly 26 million people, now need food stamps every month. How many millions of these people would be put on a crash diet by the Kasich budget? WIC Plus, indeed.

Then the Kasich budget would re-require cash payments from the poorest seniors, who live only on Social Security, for Medicare services like home health care and lab tests, which are currently free. That would take nearly \$20 billion out of the pockets of those least able to pay.

What is the bottom line, Mr. Chairman? The Kasich budget includes no full funding for Head Start and WIC, no dollars for defense conversion, no full funding of highway and mass transit and airports, no investment in new technologies. No investment tax credit for business expansion, no targeted capital gains tax cut, no extension of the research and development tax credit, no extension of the tax exemption

for mortgage revenue bonds, no extension of the low-income housing tax credit. And for all of that, less deficit reduction and more borrowing.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to reject this Kasich choice and to support, instead, a program for economic growth and tax fairness and sustained investment in American workers and American business, building a brighter and more prosperous future for all of our people. Support the committee resolution.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are back to the same old false claims again. It is incredible. I tell the Members, we first had the Democrats saying they were one-for-one in spending cuts to tax increases. In the first year it is seven in taxes to one year in cuts, but this logic, and I do not understand how they can even keep getting up and charging it, is so wrong it just calls into mind the credibility of many other figures.

Let us go back to the question of allowances. The Democrats can stand up and they can talk about the fact that there are unspecified allowances, but I urge the Members to pick up a copy of our plan, our most specific plan, where it spells out, and this is the last time I am going to get into it, the COLA freeze for Federal civilian workers, the Davis-Bacon effect, the reduced Federal civilian employment. That is not unspecified. When we have a COLA freeze on Federal workers, that is not unspecified. That is very, very specified.

The problem they have on their side is that they have the gall to come up and talk about laying down our specifics, and then they march into the Committee on the Budget, they march into the Committee on the Budget with 249 billion dollars' worth of tax increases, and when it comes time for them to lay their specifics down on the table, their \$63 billion that they needed to get under the budget caps, because CBO said their numbers were goofy, when they came back to the Committee on the Budget they would not put their fingerprints on the cuts.

That is why editorially across this country people have said that the House Republican budget committee has the most specific plan, and shame on them for the gridlock, shame on them for spending 10½ hours rejecting it on party line votes, rejecting our specific recommendations, including in the area of allowances.

In the area of allowances, their President has about \$30 billion, \$34 billion in these allowance cuts titled "streamlining government." We do not just come up with some unspecified term like "streamlining government." We are down in the paper clips, we are down in the travel, we are down in the transportation, we are down in the supplies and printing.

Thank goodness Mr. Panetta has now agreed that it was necessary to do that,

and that is why he is sending his OMB circulars saying, Let us get into Government contracts, let us get into object class 20.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I just want to make a point, because it was made again a moment ago, that there is more savings in the Democratic plan than there is in the Republican plan.

Let me repeat it again. Scored by the Congressional Budget Office, the Democratic plan is \$425 billion of deficit reduction. The Republican plan, scored by CBO, is \$429 billion. Any statement to the contrary is false, untrue, is a misstatement, is misleading.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, any statement to the contrary is simply not true. The only difference between the two plans, of course, is that we achieve that deficit reduction by spending cuts, by a margin of more than 3 to 1. The Democratic plan achieves that by tax increases.

I also want to comment on something that has been said about the WIC Program, talking about salvaging the WIC Program. I would like to point out that the average funding for WIC, as a component of all food and nutrition programs, has been 5 percent of the total fundings.

□ 1440

Our proposal includes a floor of 12-percent funding for the WIC Program, more than double the historic average that has been spent on WIC. So let us just be straightforward and get the facts straight here.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to two points that the gentleman from New York just made with respect to the tax incentives that are in the gentleman's proposal. I would simply point out that the Christmas tree with the presents under it that you outlined totaled \$70 billion in tax reductions over 5 years, but you pay for those by a Christmas tree that costs \$337 billion. So the net increase in tax is \$267 billion. Now that may sound good, but it is basically going to be a high cost.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, the other thing that I would simply relate to is what I think is an erroneous characterization of the benefits of managed care. We are picking out the Arizona

plan from the gentleman's home State, and that is a very constructive way of dealing with out-of-control costs in the Medicaid Program. And the CBO has scored that if it were applied nationally to be a savings of \$10 billion, which is exactly the kind of thing that we need to be undertaking if we are going to solve both the problems of cost and access.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY], a member of the committee.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin my remarks by commending the fine work of our chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO]. I believe his leadership has been extremely fair and produced an excellent product for this body's deliberation today. I am pleased to be a freshman member of this body and a freshman member of the Budget Committee.

Many of us were sent to Washington as a result of last fall's elections on a wave of change. The voters have had 12 years of Republican economic policy dictated out of the White House, a policy based on three principal components. First, coddle the financially comfortable; second, ignore the poor; and third, mislead the middle class with empty words of support while yielding a financial situation in this country that left them worse off and sharing a higher burden and a higher level of debt that imperiled the future of the next generation. The voters demanded a change, and they got one starting at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, a change that has brought forward before this body today an economic recovery package and the steepest deficit reduction package ever proposed by a President and brought to the floor by a Budget Committee.

In contrast, the amendment before us, and I applaud the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for going through the difficult rigors of preparing and overcoming the objections within his own party to put it before us, but when you look at the alternative proposed by this amendment, it is as if the election never happened. It clings fast to the failed policies rejected decisively in last fall's election.

First, it coddles the financially comfortable. Eighty-eight percent of the \$240 billion revenue difference between the plans comes from the failure of the Kasich plan to address the incredible wealth amassed by the wealthiest Americans over the last decade, by the failure of the plan to impose restrictions on lobbying deductions or any other taxes for corporations.

The plan clings to that Republican tenet of ignoring the poor. It eliminates all new investment in Head Start, child nutrition, and eliminates the proposed earned investment tax credit designed to help the working

poor, and reduces fully 50 percent college student aid.

And, finally, it continues the past failed practices of misleading the middle class. They say no new taxes, no new taxes are in this plan. But if you look at the Medicare section alone, there are new charges assessed without regard to ability to pay, projected to bring in nearly \$20 billion. They call them copays, but to the extent these are charges not presently assessed, they are a tax, a tax imposed in the most unfair way of all. Rather than a broad-based tax, rather than a tax based on ability to pay, the \$20 billion they will pull in from Medicare recipients comes from the sickest, most elderly of our population.

A final flaw with the Kasich alternative is timing. The same group that said do nothing, do nothing to help this country from slipping into a recession that displaced millions of workers across the country, now want to do nothing to get us going again. And in fact, they front load their cuts in a way that is almost sure to push us back into yet another recession while we are barely sustaining a recovery today.

Small wonder, I think it is small wonder that many Republicans never wanted to see this plan come to the floor. In my opinion, it presents all too clearly the stark contrast in the alternatives before this body today.

I urge rejection of the Kasich amendment.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS].

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I do not want us to lose sight of the big picture issue that we are dealing with at this moment, and the issue that we are responding to, the challenge issued by President Clinton to be specific, to come forward with literally dozens of sensible, common sense driven suggestions by which we can reduce the oppressive tax burden on the people of America as well as begin to roll back some of the unnecessary spending that has taken place in this city over the years.

I believe we have met that challenge, and I want to point to one place where I think the American people can relate to just how significantly this Federal Government of ours has grown over the last 20 years.

I would point out that the budget for travel in the Federal Government, the travel budget alone is in excess of \$7 billion. This is the class 20 classification the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] talked of earlier, \$7 billion in travel.

Do Members know what we found when we actually looked at how these moneys were disbursed? In the 12th month of the fiscal year, the very last month, there was a 48-percent increase in the amount spent on travel. Why?

Because managers in government decided they should spend down all of their available travel allowances, so it shows up in the final month of the fiscal year.

If we would compel that in the 12th month of the fiscal year they spent simply the average amount spent in the other 11 months, we could save \$2 billion. That is how soft the underbelly of this Federal Government has grown.

There are enormous opportunities in telephones, in travel, in printing, in consulting contracts. The Democrats are silent. The Republicans have stepped up and said let us look at these categories. Let us work in good faith to reduce the overhead, administrative expenses of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, my State of New Jersey took a route 3 years ago which said you can tax yourself into prosperity. It has been a disaster, a disaster for the middle class that the proponents of that tax program said that they were seeking to help.

The new energy tax from President Clinton, the tax on Social Security for our seniors, those are going to be harmful to this country. We ought not increase the tax burden. We should meet our responsibility to be specific.

That is what this Republican alternative budget has done.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE], a member of the committee.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, before I talk about infrastructure a little bit, this travel thing kind of interests me. It came up in the Budget Committee. I agree that you found some incidents where there has been an abuse of travel or places where apparently travel could have been cut back, and that certainly needs to be done and I applaud you. Of course, that is what we have been doing on our side, and that is what the commission that Vice President GORE has been heading up is doing.

□ 1450

I just have to ask: Who has been signing the travel vouchers for the last 12 years? Where did this suddenly come from? Did these folks just walk out to the airport without any kind of control?

It seems to me before you come in here talking about all of these great finds, where have you been for the 12 years? That is the problem with your budget. It is a 12-year-old budget. It is 12-year-old rhetoric.

This election was about getting this country moving again. It was not about stagnation. It was about being willing to make the public investment that has to be made, and so just as we are hearing the same tired talk to the last 12 years, I think it is time to realize that there is a new breeze blowing here.

This new breeze is this: There is a siren song out of the Kasich budget, "Oh, we can do it all in cuts. Happy day, all in cuts; there are no taxes. It is only candy. All in cuts, will not hurt anybody." Of course, there are no tax cuts in this one either, the tax cuts that are in our stimulus package. There are no investments in this either, but, "Oh, no, we can do it all."

Well, let us talk about it. There is a reason that public investment is down by one-half, 50 percent, in the last 30 years, from roughly 4½ percent of gross national product to roughly 2½ percent. Why is that? Because of the decline in investment that you have got in this budget that you would propose.

Indeed, we are talking about growth. Let us talk about highways. Under the Kasich budget, do you think you ought to be getting away from the orange barrels that are blocking traffic, the fact that you cannot do the maintenance, the fact that we never get the full amount back from the gasoline taxes that people pay? Do not look to the Kasich budget, because that will cut you over the next few years around \$7 billion.

What about mass transit? Do not look to the Kasich budget. That is about a 50-percent cut in that.

Airports: Are you tired of the fact that we only built one major airport in the last 20 years? Do not look to the Kasich budget. They cut that.

Clean water: mandates, once again, without money; the clean water program would be cut roughly \$9.2 billion. That is sewers, that is cleaning up our environment, \$9.2 billion over 5 years.

Economic conversion: so important that the President has recommended not only in the stimulus package but additional sums to economic development and administration, cut by the Kasich budget. They would not exist, these increases.

What about all of the defense plants that are closing down and the towns and communities that need assistance? They get no help from this budget. Do not look to them.

This election was about getting the economy moving. The Kasich budget is a guarantee of gridlock. It is a no-growth budget.

If you do not believe that investment in this country is important, do not invest in the House budget, but if you do believe that investment is so important, then you have got to invest that vote in the House budget which is very, very crucial: highways, mass transit, growth, economic conversion, all of it in our budget, none of it over there.

I think now people understand why it is so important that the election was about new priorities, and this vote today is about new priorities and whether we get about them.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. INGLIS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I could not help but, on listening to the last speaker talking about themes, think for the moment that maybe we do have a new theme, the Fleetwood Mac Presidential theme song now ought to be, "Tax, Spend, Think About Cutting Tomorrow." That is the new theme.

Mr. INGLIS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Arizona wants to sing that rather than just speak it. That would be nice.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I think it is very interesting to follow the gentleman from West Virginia, because two things I have found very interesting in the discussions over the hearings that we had in the Committee on the Budget, particularly from Lloyd Bentsen, Secretary Bentsen.

There are two things that he said that were very interesting to me, or one that I observed there, and actually one when the Director of CBO was speaking.

When Secretary Bentsen was there, I asked him, "Mr. Secretary, I am concerned that this stimulus package is largely a package of pork, that constitutes really a big lump of sugar that is going to help the medicine go down," and the Secretary—and this is in the testimony—the Secretary said, "Well, Mr. INGLIS, it was necessary to get enough votes to make this package work." I appreciate his candor. But the candor does show the problem.

This stimulus package is in large part pork, and the result is that it becomes a big lump of sugar, and that helps the medicine go down of the largest tax increase in the history of the United States.

The second thing about this stimulus package, and this is actually the Director of CBO that testified to this, he pointed out that a \$30 billion stimulus package, or if it is, in fact, a \$16 billion, and it is sort of difficult to account which one it is, if it is that small, he said it is an insignificant stimulus to a \$6 trillion economy that is taking off. However, it is a significant increase in the deficit.

That is what it is, My colleagues, I would ask you to look very closely at that stimulus package and realize that it really is very insignificant to a \$6 trillion economy.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR].

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Chairman, let me ask this of my colleagues and fellow Americans: If not now, when?

If not now, then we do not deserve to represent the people of the United States in this Chamber.

If not now, then we will not be able to look the children of those people in the eye.

If not now, then we place on those children a crushing burden we do not have the moral fiber to shoulder ourselves.

If not now, then we live with the disgrace of our shame, indecision, and outright cowardice for the rest of our lives.

If not now, then we are saying never, and I weep for our country.

The time for change is now.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the head of the Republican conference.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin this process by first congratulating the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the members of the Republican Budget Committee. In the 8 years that I have been in Congress and watched this budget process, this is the most professional, most dedicated, and most real effort that I have seen by any budgeteering group.

They have got the right conceptual framework, that we ought to grow down the size of the Government and allow more freedom to grow up the free-enterprise sector of the American economy, that only by growth in the private sector can we generate the revenues to support this enormous Government spending program, and only then can we decrease the deficit if we combine with that growth in revenues from a growing private sector a containment of growth in the public sector.

It takes courage. It takes commitment. It takes details.

A few weeks ago we were challenged on our side of the aisle to put up or shut up, and the fact of the matter is the Republicans on the Committee on the Budget put up details, pain, sacrifice, not sacrifice by those of us who Senator GRAMM says are pulling the wagon and paying higher taxes by heaping on more taxes, but sacrifice by those who are in the wagon by reductions in Government largesse and containment of the size of Government.

What do we have from the Democrats? The Democrat package can be broken down into three components: the pain, the payoff, and the promise.

The pain is the massive tax increases which are immediate and certain on all of the American people, and if in fact you happen to be earning \$30,000 a year and suffering a tax increase by this Clinton plan, they will perform the magic of redefinition and give you by a redefinition of your income the status of being a wealthy American by imputing to you through the Government alleged earnings of your children, the rental value of your home, the inside value buildup of your retirement programs, the cheating on your taxes that this Government under Clinton is as-

suming that we all do by either unreported or underreported income, they will make you wealthy.

This Presidency is going to make us all wealthy by simply redefining income.

Now, in addition to that pain, we have the payoff to all of the Government agencies, the supporters, the communities. In addition to all of that payoff in this Government stimulate pork package, we have then the promise.

The promise we have all heard before to the American citizens is, once again, the Democrats have said, "Take the pain of the higher taxes, allow us to fulfill the payoff to our constituency groups, allow us to provide the pork early, and we promise you the cuts later."

□ 1500

Ladies and gentlemen, the cuts will not arrive, the cuts will not get off the launching pad. The cuts are the fiction of Democratic budgetary policy. The pain is real, the suffering is optional.

Vote for Kasich, vote against the Democrats' fiction.

Mr. Chairman, the plan offered by President Clinton and the Democrat majority and the one developed by the Budget Committee Republicans offer the American people a stark contrast in our respective parties' approach to tax and budget policy. The Democrats want to tax the people and grow the Government, while Republicans want to grow the private sector and constrain the Government.

The Democrat package contains the largest tax increase in American history and tens of billions in new spending. By contrast, the Republican alternative cuts spending and the deficit \$430 billion without increasing taxes, without slashing defense and without cutting Social Security.

The Democrat package can be broken down into three components; the pain, the payoff, and the promise. The pain is massive tax increases, which are immediate and certain. The payoff is the stimulate Government package which, even the Washington Post notes, is an effort to reward Democrat constituencies with taxpayer money. And the promise—one we've heard so many times before—is that a few years from now we'll cut Government spending.

In reality, the Democrat plan will grow the Government and shrink the economy. It will mean fewer jobs for ordinary Americans, particularly when coupled with the new wave of regulations we are certain to see on behalf of Big Labor and other special interests. The reason job growth has been stagnant is that the tax and regulatory burden on small business has increased 34 percent in the last few years. And I remind my Democrat friends that during the Reagan boom—the longest peacetime expansion of the economy in history—it was small business that created 75 percent of the new jobs in America.

What does the Republican plan do? It achieves more deficit reduction than the Clinton plan by reducing Federal spending less than 3 percent. That's right, 3 percent. It's ap-

palling that my friends in the Democrat majority and the new Democrats in the White House would stick the American taxpayer with the largest tax increase in American history while refusing to reduce Government by even 3 percent. In fact, the Democrat plan adds tens of billions in new spending.

While the Democrat plan asks all Americans to pay higher taxes for more Government, the Republican plan asks the beneficiaries of Government largesse to contribute to deficit reduction. The Republican plan cuts Federal overhead, reduces Congress' bloated budget, asks wealthy Medicare recipients to pay a larger portion of their health care costs, requires Federal workers to work until age 62 like everyone else instead of retiring at 55. It reforms foreign aid, puts Medicaid patients in a managed care program, and saves taxpayer dollars by empowering low-income Americans to use housing vouchers instead of building expensive, crime-ridden public housing. And best of all, the Republican plan eliminates unnecessary programs and Government agencies like the Interstate Commerce Commission, which was created in 1887 to regulate the railroads.

I would like to compliment my colleague, Mr. KASICH, and the other Republicans on the Budget Committee for putting together an honest, fair, and well-balanced plan that reduces the deficit without raising taxes. This plan attacks the root of our deficit problem: runaway Federal spending.

Balancing the budget and encouraging a prosperous and growing economy requires a two-point plan. We must first limit Government spending, as this plan does. And we must pass a pro-growth package which reduces the cost of capital and labor and encourages our people to save and invest.

Mr. Chairman, I would say in closing that the Clinton tax-and-spend plan will fail. As I told another President 3 years ago during the 1990 budget summit, higher taxes and higher spending will stifle growth in the private economy, kill jobs, and not reduce the deficit. The Clinton plan is the 1990 budget deal part II in super 3-D with twice the tax increase. I urge my colleagues to reject the Big Government Democrat agenda and support the Kasich alternative, which cuts \$430 billion from the deficit and gets America back on the path to prosperity by asking Government to sacrifice, not American taxpayers.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party is running scared. They could not believe that Bill Clinton would put together a real budget with real numbers that really reduce the deficit. And he did.

He ran on a platform of reinvesting in America but in reducing the budget deficit, and here we are; we are doing it.

Now, I must say I give some credit to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH]. Unlike most of the other Republicans who did not want to put up any budget at all, at least he has had the decency and the courage to put together a list of cuts. I wonder how many votes it

will get on that side of the aisle. It certainly cannot get a majority of votes.

We are back to playing the same old game, every single Member in this body can put together their own list of cuts that they can vote for without much political damage, without substantively bothering them, and we end up with 435 budgets. But we end up with no budget, and the deficit gets bigger and bigger and bigger.

Well, the American people asked for one thing in the election more than anything else, they asked for an end to gridlock. They really were asking, even those elected from your side of the aisle, to come over and compromise and work on a bipartisan budget. But that was not to be.

And so we alone have come up with a budget. Do we have differences in opinion about what it might be here? Sure. But we are going to pass a budget, and we are going to reduce the deficit, and we are going to play the games that have been played on that side of the aisle about putting together something that 100 or even 150 Members might vote for but cannot carry a majority, because above all we must act.

The Kasich budget puts a dagger at the heart of urban America and puts together a budget that knocks out whatever is left of urban programs. I could do the same and put the budget together that did the same to rural America and get 150 votes on my side of the aisle, but it would not pass and it would not reduce the deficit.

So I say to my colleagues here there is really only one game in town and that is a budget that can pass and reduce the deficit and get us on the road to recovery and end the gridlock.

The budget that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has taken from the White House and, even, improved is that budget. I urge a "no" vote on the Kasich amendment despite his commendable courage in putting together cuts; and I ask for a "yes" vote on the Democratic proposal.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, in the last election there was a mandate for change and not a mandate for more of the same. What I am hearing in the course of this debate today is you cannot cut this and you cannot cut that.

Back in 1985 a group of us got together and in 1986 offered budgets on the floor to avert the precise fiscal crisis we are faced with today, and we hear the same refrain: "You can't cut this and you can't cut that."

You are darned right we are front loading the spending cuts; it is no coincidence that in the President's economic plan that all the spending cuts are safely deferred to the years 1997

and 1998. That is because they are never going to happen. Now, the Kasich plan demonstrates how you can achieve the same deficit reduction numbers in the President's economic plan but doing it through spending cuts, without having to raise taxes. And it is specific.

My major concern with the plan on the other side is that we are not going to get the spending cuts. Two, we are not specific.

I have yet to hear how they arrived at the \$510 billion. The last we knew through the CBO scoring, it was \$425 billion, including the \$63 billion in unspecified cuts.

Now, understand, the \$30 billion of that \$63 billion occurs in 1998. A plug of \$30 billion in 1998 that we do not know what is going to happen in terms of cuts.

Now, we know the appropriating and authorizing committees can achieve a recommended aggregate number in a different way, but we have an obligation as members of the Committee on the Budget to at least demonstrate one feasible way as to how you arrive at those numbers, so that we are not reduced to just picking numbers out of the hat, which has happened time and time again here in this Congress. And that is why we are in the situation in which we are today.

Let us look at foreign assistance, because I think it illustrates the difference between the Kasich plan and the budget resolution out of the Committee on the Budget.

We have doubled the cuts in foreign assistance over the budget resolution passed by the Democratic majority in the committee. We doubled them. The President's economic plan originally called for an increase in foreign assistance in 1994 by \$51 million. Now, the majority came back and inserted another \$2 billion because they realized that it was deficient in this category, but we still doubled them.

Now, the point is that they have not yet been able to specify how they are going to make those cuts in foreign aid. Now, ladies and gentlemen, if you are asking my constituents, whose average per capita income is \$14,800, to pay more in home heating oil because of the energy tax, do we not owe it to them to say, "Yes, we are going to cut foreign assistance substantially?" I think they deserve to know from us that we are going to specify cuts in programs like foreign assistance. We can at least double our cuts in foreign assistance if we are asking them to pay more for home heating oil. I think that is logical and fair.

So, what are we getting in return for the largest tax increase in the history of this country? Well, we are getting more spending this year, we are getting a spending cut of \$6 billion in 1994 out of a \$1.5 trillion budget; only \$6 billion in spending cuts. We get spending in-

creases each and every year under the Clinton economic plan.

In return for the taxpayers in this country paying for the largest tax increase in the history of this country, that is, and yes, the spending cuts I have referred to, the majority of them occur in 1997, 1998; only 6 percent of them occur in the first year.

I think we owe the American people more than that, ladies and gentlemen. We can do a better job.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], a member of our committee.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say initially that I join with some of my other colleagues in paying my respects to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] at least on the process of getting a budget alternative together, putting it out there, providing specifics. He has met the process test.

But on the substance of the budget, I think you have to say this is truly a budget with no vision whatsoever. There are no investments, there are no changes in the priorities. This is a budget that represents the same tired priorities of the last 12 years: neglect, supply-side voodoo economics, and trickle-down mythology.

There appears to be no investment issue either in the spending or in the tax reduction side. There is blatant neglect of education and training priorities.

The Kasich plan does not include full funding of Head Start by 1999. Only 37 percent of eligible children can be enrolled in the Head Start Program, based on the current funding levels assumed in the Kasich alternative. There are no initiatives for the National Service Corps budget. There is no mention whatsoever of youth apprenticeship programs to prepare non-college-bound high school students to make the transition to careers. There is no increase here for summer youth employment and training to put youth to work in summer jobs.

□ 1510

There is no commitment in this budget to research and development.

There is no short-term investment tax credit for new startup companies to accelerate expansion plans and order new equipment.

They do not even propose the permanent extension of credit for research and experimentation.

There is no permanent extension of tax credits for targeted jobs.

There are shortsighted cuts in this budget that hurt the poor, that hurt the environment, that hurt our industrial competitiveness, and make a fundamental onslaught on our basic tenets of foreign policy. I would like to speak to that for just a moment. It is a portion of the budget that I have worked on.

The Sabo budget proposes cuts in the area of the foreign affairs function. But how can anyone in this Chamber who wants to talk sense to the American people propose a budget that rejects and cuts the administration's own suggestions for dealing with the most important national crisis of our time, because everything we want to do in the area of deficit reduction, new investments, downsizing of defense spending, focusing on domestic priorities, all that will be cast aside if the most fundamental question of what happens in the Republics of the former Soviet Union is not dealt with.

The administration proposes focusing on that. The Kasich substitute just wipes out that proposal in its entirety.

This is an issue that can get a lot of applause from people who want to appeal to the lowest common denominator of what the average voter wants to hear, but a budget that requires leadership cannot ignore what the leadership of both political parties, whether it is Richard Nixon or Bill Clinton or any of the people who have thought about this subject say we must do in this particular area.

This budget wipes out all the proposals for peacekeeping operations that are now going on and that have been given bipartisan support on both sides of this Chamber. This is making a mockery in order to say, "Oh, look what we have been able to cut in the administration's proposed budget."

I would like to touch on a couple other areas as well. We have had many debates here about Legal Services, controls, questions of how the program should be run. It is very easy, I guess, for the people who put together the Kasich substitute to decide to wipe out all Legal Services programs, the good ones along with the bad ones, the ones that are doing great jobs along with the ones that might be done, wipe them all out from any Federal budget deficit. Who cares what happens to the poor in the particular area?

On the program again that has tremendous bipartisan support, the Women, Infants, and Children, the WIC Program, and the School Lunch Program that everyone acknowledges are two examples of the best that the Government has been able to do in helping people who deserve to be helped, they combine these programs, assume a massive reduction in funds by savings that they give no discretion of how they will be achieved, and if they are not achieved will pit two of the most vital programs we have here, WIC and the school lunch program against each other for a vastly reduced amount of moneys. That is not a responsible, imaginative, and visionary budget.

I just want to touch on one last issue and that is the assumptions about the Medicare freeze and medical malpractice.

The Kasich substitute says we are going to achieve \$14.9 billion in savings

by freezing provider costs for Medicare. But will that affect the providers? No. Because the assumption here is that we reform the medical malpractice insurance system and that the \$14.9 billion in savings will come from savings realized by those particular kinds of reforms.

The fact is that less than 1 percent of our national health care costs are spent on medical malpractice insurance premiums. The defensive medical malpractices that are assumed for this are totally unrealistic. No expert detached objective person analyzing this could assume there is any logic to that.

So even in the area where they seek to throw out the challenge the most on the credibility of the specifics, the Kasich substitute falls woefully short.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this substitute be defeated and that the Budget Committee's proposal be adopted.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I just heard the comments that were made about WIC, the nutrition program. I just want to make it very clear, that the savings we get are scored by the Congressional Budget Office. They are real savings. They are in there. They are scored by the CBO.

How do you get that kind of saving? By taking 5 percent of all the nutrition programs when you block grant them and when you eliminate the duplication, when you eliminate the overlap of programs, you would probably get more than 5 percent. We used the very conservative number, that is the CBO number of 5 percent.

The Governors want these programs block granted. It is a program that would work for the States and save the American taxpayer \$5 billion and not cut any services and allow the same number of dollars or more dollars to go to the WIC Program, which is everybody's No. 1 priority.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich amendment and in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 64. In my view, Congress should forget new taxes, forget new spending, and for once prove to the American people that Congress is interested in and can cut spending. Why do I say this?

First, because as a result of our annual deficits, the national debt is now \$4.1 trillion. It is very, very serious.

Second, even if one assumed this budget resolution would be followed, and I frankly do not believe it will be insofar as cutting is concerned in spending, an additional \$1.65 trillion will be added to the national debt over the next 5 years, according to their own admission, and still there would be

no balanced budget in sight. Perhaps some time in the next century we may get to that, and in the fifth year of this budget, guess what, the deficit would in fact be on the rise, going up.

Third, the public has no faith in the collective will of Congress to cut spending. That is zilcho. New national taxes and spending are up front and forever, but real spending cuts are rare and they are in the outyears.

In fact, House Concurrent Resolution 64 increases spending over fiscal year 1993 in 15 out of the 19 of the major functional categories of the Federal budget for fiscal year 1994.

The people of this Nation do not have to be challenged with new taxes and more spending. They are used to that. They have had enough of it. Congress is the one to be challenged, and the challenge is to cut spending, clean out the barn.

I came to Congress in 1985, the first year of the heralded spending limits of Gramm-Rudman. Those limits were avoided, waived, repealed, scuttled, rewritten, bypassed, and ignored by Congress each time a serious spending cut was required.

I also saw the 1990 budget deficit law passed with its massive new taxes and \$500 billion of promised spending cuts. Likewise I saw it manipulated, avoided, waived, abused, and bypassed while deficits and the national debt continued to climb to all-time heights.

Indeed, the stimulus package of \$16.2 billion for fiscal year 1993 which soon will be passed by this body is based upon an avoidance of the firewalls and the spending limits of the 1990 Budget Deficit Act. How? Very simple. Just declare the whole darn stimulus package an emergency and, presto, the firewalls and the limits on spending for fiscal year 1993 come tumbling down and we add, guess what, another \$16.2 billion of deficits for our children and our grandchildren to pay.

I would submit that Congress has to stop financially abusing future generations of Americans. Our children and our grandchildren have a right to expect Congress to act responsibly.

This is *deja vu* all over again, the same thing I saw in 1985, the same thing I saw in 1990.

Forget the new taxes. Forget the new spending, and for once show the Nation that this Congress can do something for the Nation in regard to cutting spending. That is the message we ought to be hearing.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], a former member of the Committee on the Budget and current chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, let me say that this morning's newspaper reported that Mr. KASICH's budget was rejected by his Republican conference.

I think the gentleman from Ohio deserved better treatment from his Republican colleagues. He at least had the courage to stand up and to make his plan specific and to say what he would do to reduce the deficit, and my hat is off to him.

He came to Congress with me in the same year. He has shown himself to be a man of his word, but I have to echo the comments of the previous speaker, the gentleman from California, though Mr. KASICH has met the procedural requirements, on substantives I find the gentleman's offering wanting.

□ 1520

Let me tell my colleagues why. The Kasich budget is good news for fat cats, bad news for kids. The Kasich budget is good news for the independently wealthy, bad news for infants and children.

During the last 12 years, Mr. Chairman, the tax policies of the Reagan and Bush administrations have given substantial benefits to the wealthiest people in America. Working families know it. They have paid more year in year out. President Bill Clinton has said that, as part of deficit reduction, the wealthiest among us must pay their fair share of taxes, and 70 percent of all of the new tax revenue he is asking for comes from people making over a hundred thousand dollars a year.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican Kasich budget literally insulates all of the fat cats in America from any increase in their income tax rates. Yes; he would freeze in place the current inequity in the Federal tax system which heaps the burden on working families. In that respect the Kasich budget fails the fundamental test of fairness, and then, when we take a look at where the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] would make up for that money that he would not take from the wealthiest Americans, we will find that he is cutting programs that are fundamental and essential for the growth of this country, programs for which our Committee on Appropriations has the responsibility.

Let me give my colleagues one specific: the Women, Infants, and Children Supplemental Feeding Program. For those who are not aware of it, it is a program which brings in poor pregnant mothers to help them through their pregnancy, to give them the prenatal care, the nutritional advice they need to have a normal pregnancy and a healthy baby, and then we stay with them. We bring the mothers back with their small children, make sure the children are well fed, go to the doctor and follow the basic requirements to have a normal and healthy life.

My colleagues, this is an investment in the future of America. We cannot build new jobs and a new future for America with low-birth-weight babies who literally break the bank of the Federal Treasury when they show up in

the intensive care units and need to be taken care of for months at a time.

Unfortunately the Kasich budget takes a serious cut at the money that is available for the WIC Program by providing a block grant that over a period of 5 years cuts over \$6 billion, part of it from this important program.

Second, Mr. Chairman, the Kasich budget is going to eliminate President Clinton's call for universal immunization in America.

It was my pleasure and honor to serve on the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families for several years. Children who receive vaccinations in America are healthier kids who avoid the measles and diseases which put them in the hospital and run up the bills again in medical costs. We save \$10 for the American taxpayer for every dollar we put in immunizing children.

Unfortunately, my colleagues, under the plan offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], immunization is an extravagance. He would not tax the wealthy so that we could immunize the children. I see things differently, and so does President Clinton.

The other point I make is that the President's offering suggests that we improve the earned income tax credit, which is a benefit, a tax benefit, given to working families who are still struggling to get beyond the poverty level. I thought we all agreed, Democrats and Republicans, that, if the husband and wife, mother and father, would go to work and do their 40 hours a week plus, and have small kids at home, that in this Nation of America they should not be living in poverty. With a tax credit we say to these people, "We'll give you a helping hand for your effort. We want you to understand that you are participants in America's future."

Unfortunately the Kasich budget, because it will not tax the wealthiest among us, cuts off this effort by President Clinton to bring dignity to families that are striving to pull themselves out of poverty and welfare.

The bottom line is this: The Democrat budget which we are supporting is going to reduce the deficit more than the Kasich budget, and the Democrat budget is also going to get this economy moving forward again. We are going to ask the wealthiest to pay their fair share. We are going to invest in kids and our future in training, and education and health care because we believe in people.

Those who stand here and support the budget offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] are saying by and large, "We should cut out all these programs. We don't need them."

We do need them. Americans need the Democrat substitute.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I sure would like a little less praise from the Democrats and a whole lot more accuracy in regard to our plan.

I think, as everybody here knows and as has been pointed out, I think, on three separate occasions by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], of course in our block grant program we have full funding of WIC and guarantee that the States can spend no less than 12 percent, and we have covered all these arguments that they make over, and over and over again, and it is almost like saying, "Well, we've got one for one in spending cuts and taxes." That is phony baloney, just like the previous speaker in talking about us gutting WIC. It is simply not true. We have full funding for WIC under our program.

But I will tell my colleagues what we do. We get rid of all the tired, worn-out bureaucracies out there, and we bring real reform.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS] for having yielded to me.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

This week it become so much easier to show my differences with the Democrats in respect to how to spend my constituents' money.

First, a Democrat report said we should oppose the Kasich budget because it moves in the opposite direction of the Clinton plan. It does not raise taxes. I ask, "Can you believe that? Be against it because it doesn't raise taxes?" Eliminates all spending increases. "Can you believe that? Be against it because it does not eliminate all spending increases?"

Mr. Chairman, that is why I am voting for this Kasich amendment. It does not increase taxes or spending.

Today these same Democrat politicians will approve over \$16 billion in deficit spending. That is not just continuing wasteful spending. It is increasing it.

There is \$28 million for the District of Columbia, \$23 million to change light fixtures in government buildings, \$150 million for the IRS. This is spending. The President and the Democrat Congress increases, and this is what we want to cut. The differences are that clear.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the taxpayers, "Grab your wallets and run. This President and this Democrat Congress think you can't be trusted with your own money."

Now the Democrats are selling us on how to invest our constituents' money, and I ask, "Can you believe it? They are now calling taxes an investment?"

What a sad commentary, a Democrat controlled Congress that has no idea as to how to operate in the black are now reborn financial planners who want to invest our money. What a joke. Give them more money, and they will spend it.

Mr. Chairman, I think Americans can be trusted to keep their own money. Let us try that philosophy for a budget and an economic policy.

Support the Kasich amendment. It takes the first step toward deficit reduction. It cuts spending and does not raise taxes. It is a good budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], president of the freshman class.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I speak today to the urgent need to pass the budget resolution that is before us, and not the Kasich plan. Today we are challenged to take a brave stand for our Nation and the people of our districts. The eyes of the American people are upon us. We are being watched to see if we can make the tough decisions that will enable the American people to again feel secure about their economic well being. To move this country forward we must not be content with business as usual. There are those who will tell us that the economy is well. They will lead us to believe that Main Street is once again booming, and all of our workers are again full at work. While there have been some changes in the economy, there are still far too many Americans caught in the hopelessness and despair of unemployment. Far too many of our children are dying because of inadequate prenatal health care, and far too many of the roads and bridges in our towns and cities are at a point of dangerous disrepair.

The budget resolution before us presents an opportunity for us to make a bold statement, to do the right thing. The deficit is at an unacceptable level and a plan is offered to address the problem. Painful spending cuts across the board are included in this plan. Let me briefly say to my colleagues, that the budget resolution certainly does not please every one, but it is indeed moving in the right direction. It moves us toward a future of investment in the critical physical and human resources that are vital to our Nation's survival.

It directs much-needed attention to the education and immunization of our children.

It prepares our work force for the changing nature of our economy.

It addresses the special nutrition program for women, infants, and children through the WIC program.

It addresses tax changes proposed in the Presidential budget to move the economy, and it has built-in measures to keep it going once it gets on track.

In summary, the budget resolution speaks to the heart of the need once

again to focus on the needs of the people of this great Nation. And yes, it also contains a deficit-reduction plan that is not smoke and mirrors. Unfortunately, Representative KASICH, the ranking Republican member on the House Budget Committee has offered a plan that is the reverse of what the House Budget Committee has recommended. Let us look at just a few points of the plan that the Representative has proposed:

DEFICIT REDUCTION

The Kasich plan only lowers the deficit in the first 2 years. It is estimated by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities that because of the timing difference, this plan does not achieve as much long-term deficit reduction as the President's plan.

Most importantly, this plan places the greatest burden for reducing the deficit on low- and middle-income citizens.

There is no investment in our children, families, or the public infrastructure of our towns and cities.

Job training for our workers is ignored, as is research and technology development. I say it is time for us to reject business as usual, and move quickly to reject the Kasich plan and accept the budget resolution before us. It is a measure that will move this great Nation and its people forward.

Mr. Chairman, let us do this today because it is the right thing to do.

□ 1530

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE].

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Chairman, the President challenged those who oppose his budget to offer their own. Well done, Mr. President. Good politics—good policy. A democratic process should promote the public discussion of alternatives.

So today's debate is about choices, economics, and leadership. Upon what principles do we base our resolve and our approach to deal with the deficit?

I believe we have a deficit because the Government spends too much and is too ineffective and inefficient. The Democratic leadership believes we have a deficit because people are taxed too little.

I believe, and the Kasich plan reflects, the fundamental economic fact that we will never get the deficit under control until the Government gets spending under control.

The Democratic leadership believes we will never get the deficit under control until Government taxes more and spends more.

The energy tax will hurt Americans and cost jobs. Mr. President, western Pennsylvania has thousands of jobs tied to energy sensitive industries. Good jobs in competitive global markets which will be lost. Steel, paper, aluminum—and the list goes on.

Taxing our way to deficit reduction will put some of these people on the unemployment lines. The tax is regressive, inflationary, and a very bad idea.

New spending will increase the cost of long-term Government which predictably will require more revenue. The expansion of Government is a novel approach to deficit reduction. It doesn't make sense to me. We should be looking for ways to make a \$1.5 trillion Government better, not bigger.

My colleagues, we cannot tax our way to prosperity and we cannot bluff our way to a balanced budget.

The only way to reduce the deficit is to permanently reduce spending and, by doing so, the size of Government.

In 1980, the American people sent \$517 billion to Washington for the Federal Government to spend. By 1989, revenues had grown to nearly \$1 billion, yet we remained over \$150 billion in the red. So, in spite of taxpayers digging deeper and paying more, the Government's insatiable appetite still could not be controlled.

That's the picture, the more people pay, the more Government spends. Let us add one more certainty to Ben Franklin's list—the only certainties in life are death, taxes, and more Government spending.

The Kasich plan recognizes the need to reduce spending as the only way to reduce the deficit. I don't agree with all of it. I differ with my friend on his approach to Davis-Bacon, legal services, and other components. But, like any blueprint, we can move some lines around to accommodate different priorities. As a spending blueprint for Congress, the Kasich plan offers the most promise to deal honestly with the deficit.

The Kasich budget simply recognizes that before we ask people to open their wallets and pay more taxes, Government should tighten its own belt, and do a much better job with the dollars the American taxpayers already send to Washington.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD].

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the Kasich substitute and in support of the Budget Committee's fiscal year 1994 budget resolution.

The gentleman from Ohio is to be commended for his diligence and his passion in crafting his substitute amendment. There is much in the plan that I can support, and will support as the reconciliation process moves forward. I too want to kill World War II-era agricultural subsidies. I especially want to be able to support a budget that doesn't increase taxes.

The Kasich substitute calls for significant budget cuts, no question about it. But it fails on a number of other counts. Most importantly, it fails to pass the test of fairness. The Kasich

amendment puts an incredibly unfair burden on the elderly and the poor to balance the budget. It calls for an additional 50-percent cut in Medicare beyond what the Budget Committee recommended, yet it does so in the absence of any plan for comprehensive health care reform.

Kasich asks our senior citizens to pay more, but makes no commitment to seniors to address skyrocketing health care costs.

That's just not fair.

The Kasich plan calls for \$8.6 billion in savings over 5 years by consolidating WIC, food stamps, and the School Lunch Program. Mr. Chairman, there is a reason that WIC has bipartisan support—It works. Right now WIC serves just 60 percent of the Nation's women, infants, and children living below the poverty line.

Mr. Chairman, that is just not fair.

The Kasich amendment fails to address the economic realities facing our Nation. We are facing a painful transformation as we wean ourselves from the defense buildup of the 1980's. Cuts in weapons systems have already hit my district. In a few weeks, we are going to vote on a plan to close dozens of military bases nationwide. Yet under the Kasich budget, we cannot help any of the thousands of workers and their communities as they go through this painful transition.

It's just not fair.

Mr. Chairman, we must do more than cut spending if we are to see progress in deficit reduction. We must reprioritize how we spend, for the economy must grow to bring in adequate revenues. Without significant investments in highways and airports, education, job training and R&D, the private sector can't provide the growth necessary to bring the budget into balance. By cutting student aid, by maintaining the status quo on job training, and by eliminating the Commerce Department, the Kasich budget fails to prepare us for the economy of the future.

Mr. Chairman, it's just not fair, and it's just not smart.

Finally, I feel obligated to point out that the Kasich budget includes a provision of particular detriment to the schoolchildren of Utah. Specifically, it would prohibit all Federal land acquisitions for 5 years. This provision could devastate years of negotiation to resolve a long-standing dispute between the Federal Government and the State of Utah over the use of State-owned school trust lands.

I am prepared to cast difficult votes—that's why we were sent here. I want to ensure that the 103d Congress, and the Clinton administration, are heralded by historians as the ones that brought an end to gridlock in Washington and set our Nation on a new course of fiscal responsibility.

The Budget Committee has given us a good framework—a fair framework—

to begin this transition. The Kasich budget in spite of its good points, falls short. I urge its defeat and the adoption of the committee plan.

□ 1540

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentlewoman from Utah, if she was worried and concerned about military base closings last Friday, if this Clinton plan gets enacted, which I am sure Les Aspin does not favor, really, if he had his way it would not be anything like this, almost everybody in this country who has anything to do with the military is going to be shaking in their boots when we get to the base closing commissions that are yet to be ahead under this blueprint for Pentagon devastation.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich amendment. It has been a very long debate, and I have listened to most of it. We have all thought about this a great deal.

I was particularly interested in my friend from Illinois. He and I had made a trip to Europe last year to help the Baltic States get away from having too much government because that was not an answer to their problem.

I think all of us here have decided where we are. There is no need to talk, in my view, about details. Everyone here, I think, wants to achieve certain goals. Such goals as a strong economy, good, strong dependable jobs, the ability for people to own homes and educate their children. We all want to do this.

Frankly, I am not persuaded that more taxes and more spending is the way to do that. I am not persuaded that we continue to take more money out of the private sector, put it in the public sector is the way to achieve those goals.

Indeed, it seems to me that we do better in achieving these goals with less government, rather than more. Pretty simple. If we have less taxes, rather than more. Pretty simple. We leave dollars in the private sector. That is where jobs and wealth are created.

I cannot imagine the largest tax increase in our history helping us achieve the goals of a stronger economy.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Kasich substitute to the House Budget resolution. The Kasich substitute not only falls about \$15 billion short from the committee's deficit reduction efforts, but it also does not

include any of the Clinton initiatives for education, for health and job training, nor does it include any of the President's tax incentives for small business investment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to focus my remarks this afternoon on the Republican proposal to lump together several Federal nutrition programs, including WIC, food stamps, and school lunch into one block grant for States.

In the past, Mr. Chairman, we have heard this siren song of block grants being more efficient than targeted Federal programs. And, like in the past, the Republican proposal to throw these programs into one budget bag and then cut them back in their funding by \$6.8 billion falls short of what is good.

Why is it that when we have a defense program in trouble, like the B-1 bomber or the C-17 transport plane, defense hawks say we can fix those problems by putting more money or throwing more money at them? Yet somehow, domestic programs like WIC or school lunch are expected to work better and serve more people when we give them less money. And we are, under the Kasich proposal, giving them less, \$6.8 billion less over the 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, study after study has shown that cutting WIC funding would be penny-wise and pound-foolish. My subcommittee has jurisdiction over this program, and I am very familiar with it.

The USDA and the GAO and others have found that each dollar spent in the prenatal component of WIC results in savings of between \$1.92 and \$4.21 in Medicaid costs due to fewer low-weight babies needing hospitalization.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], I am sure, because I have great respect for him, sincerely believes that WIC is protected in his proposal. But it is not, I assure him. It is not.

I do not think there is anyone in this House more familiar with WIC than I am. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, the Republicans' WIC-plus proposal does not make sense from an administrative efficiency point of view.

Usually, block grants combine Federal programs, which are run by the same State or local agency. However, in this instance, State health departments run the WIC program, because eligibility is based upon health-related needs. Schools, on the other hand, operate the School Lunch Program, because that is where the schoolchildren are, in school. And county welfare agencies operate the Food Stamp Program because eligibility is based upon income level.

We have three separate Federal nutrition programs with three very different target populations with different needs, different venues.

Mr. Chairman, the Kasich substitute has less deficit reduction, over \$145 billion in unallocated ghost savings, and

has unworkable new proposals like WIC-plus which do not make economic sense or administrative sense.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is very sincere. I commend him on his work. But his work falls short of what is needed here. I urge my colleagues to reject the Kasich substitute.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], for one more refutation.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I have just heard about this program once again. Here we go.

We are not cutting the WIC spending. We are going to cut the administrative overhead. Is there one person out here that thinks that these programs are so efficient that we cannot take 5 percent out for administrative costs? Five percent is what we are talking about taking out.

This thing has been studied since 1974. There was a recommendation in 1974 that we combine these programs. The Governors are asking for this. They want the savings of combining these programs, of reducing the administrative overhead.

We think we can get rid of this legislation. What is it about the School Lunch Program that makes the gentleman think that we should be subsidizing the sons and daughters of millionaires?

We would target these programs to those that are 185 percent of poverty or under. Not to everybody, as the School Lunch Program does.

Our program would guarantee, instead of 5 percent of funding in all these programs for WIC, now, a floor of 12 percent, 2½ times as much funding for WIC as we now have.

Our program would make WIC a real program and let it be run efficiently.

The gentleman wants to keep the bureaucracies in place in the States and the Federal Government.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER].

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994 and in strong opposition to the Kasich substitute amendment.

We have a choice today, indeed, Mr. Chairman. Do we return to the philosophy of old, a philosophy that has almost ruined the Nation, or do we move forward, move forward with new vision?

We all know that we must reduce the deficit, but the question is, do we do it while at the same time investing—investing in our children, investing in jobs, investing in training and education, or do we choose not to invest in America at all?

The President's economic plan and the budget that has been reported by the Committee on the Budget answers the question by saying that we must

invest at the same time as reducing the budget deficit by \$510 billion over the next 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of criticism about this package from the Republicans, but is it not interesting that it is their party that is responsible for the budget deficit that has ballooned in the last 12 years? And now they want to tell us how to cure it.

Mr. Chairman, we Democrats are saddled with the responsibility of reducing the deficit and at the same time stimulating the economy. And, most certainly, we will not be able to do it with the Kasich amendment.

The resolution of the Committee on the Budget contains the stimulus portion of the President's plan and provides for a real package to reduce the deficit. Investment is just what we imagine it to be, sacrificing and spending today for a benefit tomorrow.

We must invest in the WIC Program. We must invest in SBA loans. We must invest with increased funding for people like the people in my district, hard-working Americans, Mr. Chairman, who have resoundingly rejected the gridlock and failed economic approaches of the Bush and Reagan years and overwhelmingly demanded action, and action and investment right now.

The Kasich amendment is one-dimensional. It is concerned with only one segment of society, and those are the fat cats who made off with big bucks in the 1980's and who now do not want to put their fair share into this till in taxation. It is unfair. It is insensitive, and it is not right.

We still have in this country 8.9 million people and more who are unemployed.

□ 1550

We still have in this country a need to put \$1 billion into the summer jobs for disadvantaged youth this summer. We have a situation in Los Angeles right now that we are looking at another riot, and we have not recovered from the riots of last year. We need the investment that is reported by the budget resolution of the Budget Committee.

We need \$4 billion for emergency unemployment benefits. We need another \$2.6 billion for SBA loans, and most certainly, we need the \$1.9 billion for the shortfall in funding for the Pell grant situation. We need the \$3 billion for highway projects.

We cannot in any way afford the Kasich amendment and all of the concerns for investment that it overlooks and that it leaves out. The people of America elected President Clinton, and now the people of America must reject the Kasich amendment.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Republican alter-

native of the Committee on the Budget. It is by far the best plan that will be considered today. The Republican alternative is \$430 billion of real, specified deficit reduction. It consists of straightforward cuts, which denies the Government a means to spend more. We cut 160 programs and we tell how we did it.

In contrast to the Democratic plan, the Republican plan gets to work immediately by cutting Federal spending \$38 billion in the first year compared to the Democrats' \$6 billion cut. Unlike the Democrats, who slapped on \$60 billion in generic cuts at the last minute, our plan provides point-by-point, program-by-program specifics of who, what, when, where, and the why of how spending cuts are done.

I am particularly pleased with the cuts we made in the area of administrative overhead and personnel. We aim to reduce the waste, fraud, and mismanagement in Government. Simply, we intend to increase the Government's tooth-to-tail ratio, increasing the part that works and reducing the part that gets dragged around behind.

In the area of overhead we went straight to what is called object class 20 of Federal spending, which includes what the Government spends on travel, transportation, rental payments, printing, consulting, communications, and supplies. These categories add up to a whopping \$340 billion annually. We then made sure that we took everything out that was not real, direct, Federal spending so that there could be no quibbling that the cuts we made weren't possible.

We got down to what are called the direct expenses—the money the Government actually spends and that came to \$222 billion. But we didn't stop there either. We went all the way down to the Clinton number of \$55 billion.

And from all these billions of dollars, we took out \$7 billion in the first year and \$48 billion over 5 years.

The Republicans on the House Budget Committee have produced a plan that will lower deficits and create economic growth from day one. Compare this to the Democrat plan that produces taxes from day one and economic growth from day none.

Today, we have a choice: between more taxes and no taxes. The Democrat plan offers deficit reduction through more taxes. The Republican plan offers deficit reduction through more spending cuts. The Democrats would have you believe that the only way to reduce the deficit is to raise taxes. We Republicans are showing that this is not true.

We do have a choice: Between high taxes and no taxes, between obstacles to economic growth and incentives to economic growth, a choice between words and action, a choice between the taxing and spending that Congress has always done and the real cuts that it

has never done. A choice between Democrat and Republican plans. When you compare what they do, the choice is clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] that he has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], a member of the committee.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

The Republicans put together the Kasich budget because we are serious about deficit reduction. We believe that we cannot eliminate deficit spending unless we actually cut spending. The Clinton plan, on the other hand, as brought to the floor by the House Democrats, increases spending by \$244 billion, and despite the protestations on this side about significant spending cuts, it contains no net spending cuts, not this year, not next year, not any year in the future.

Whom do you believe? I am going to put my money where my mouth is. I will write out a personal check for \$100,000, payable to Bill Clinton and the Democratic National Committee, if next year's spending is less than this year's spending. I will resign my congressional seat and I will write 100 times "I apologize to the Democrats. They were telling the truth. They really did cut spending."

Meanwhile, I will put my money and my vote behind the Kasich budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman and the Members of the Republican side of the Committee on the Budget for their very, very fine work. Let me tell the Members, I support the Kasich budget. I do that because it is the only budget we are going to see today that leaves the United States with a modicum of national defense.

Let us go to the baseline and see exactly what we are doing here. President Bush asked the people who won Desert Storm to put together a budget that would maintain the security of the United States and still allow for some efficiencies. Those people, Dick Cheney, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Colin Powell, and others, went to work and they cut about \$50 billion out of the 1990 budget agreement. That was the agreement where Democrats and Republicans put together a number that we thought would be adequate to defend America. President Bush went \$50 billion below that.

Now the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the Committee on the Budget have gotten together, they have worked on efficiencies, they have

pulled down about \$60 billion below that level. To me that is just barely enough to defend America, but it is still much better than the Democrat budget.

Interestingly, Mr. Aspin, the former chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, now Secretary of Defense, put together his option C, and it is just about where the Kasich budget is. It is \$60 billion below the Bush baseline.

Let me tell the Members, the world is a very, very dangerous place. I want to go over four things that are happening right now that every Member should think about, because every Member here has young men and women in the armed services who need the right equipment. Everyone here has a duty to defend this country beyond the Constitution. That is the most important social program that we give out.

Right now in the Soviet Union, the former Soviet Union, we still have four states, four Russian states that have nuclear systems. The pink slips on those systems, just who controls them, is still in doubt. We have hard-liners taking over, paralyzing the Yeltsin administration. In Bosnia we have a situation that is blowing up. In North Korea we see the North Koreans pulling out of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

We have North Korea posing a great danger to the United States, and we have missiles proliferating around the world, and especially in the Middle East.

Everybody who is responsible here should vote for the Kasich budget. It is the closest thing to the Aspin option C that we have seen, and the Democrat budget absolutely guts national defense. Lastly, the Democrat budget will lead to a round of base closures that will devastate and render into a ghost town every military town in this country.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and in support of the budget resolution reported by the Budget Committee, House Concurrent Resolution 64.

The President and the Democrats in Congress have presented an investment package that carefully balances the needs and ambitions of our country for jobs, housing, education, and economic development, with the daunting reality of an out-of-control budget deficit. The budget accomplishes this delicate balance by fairly placing the greatest burden on those that reaped the greatest returns in the hit-and-run 1980's.

For the first time in more than a decade, the executive and legislative branches of Government are coming to-

gether to outline the future of this country. That future is paved by a plan that commits two out of every three dollars saved from spending cuts and revenue increases for deficit reduction, while one out of every three dollars saved is used for new investment. As a result, the budget substantially reduces the deficit while also making sizable investments to address unmet needs.

I admit that I would have preferred a package that went further in addressing the needs of our devastated communities, a package that would have contained more social investment. I was particularly concerned when \$63 billion in cuts were added to the President's initial plan. These are real cuts in significant areas, some of which hurt. That is why I feel strongly that the economic stimulus package cannot be altered.

We must recognize that the disastrous economic decisions of the Reagan/Bush years have choked us with a long running economic recession. It has especially affected low-wage laborers and people of color, and damaged the prospects for long-term economic growth in this country.

This Republican substitute sinks us deeper into economic disinvestment. We must oppose the Kasich substitute. We must support the Democratic budget package. And, we must support the President's stimulus package without cuts. Only then, will we get this Nation moving toward investment, growth, and equity.

□ 1600

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the great city of Columbus, Ohio, Ms. PRYCE.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud my friend Mr. KASICH's plan to solve our country's problems without raising taxes.

Yesterday, I listened closely as our colleagues have been discussing how we're going to cut the deficit, restore the economy, and create lasting new jobs—all at the same time.

I can tell you right now that raising taxes on working Americans is not the answer. We have been down that road before—of promised fiscal discipline in exchange for higher taxes. We swallowed the bitter tax pill in 1990, and guess what happened? Economic growth slowed down and valuable jobs were lost.

Every day I read letters from back home and I know that for hardworking taxpayers living in middle America, higher taxes will really hit home.

For a lot of families all across America like those in central Ohio, paying more in taxes will mean really feeling the hurt in everyday life—like waiting another year to buy new boyscout uni-

forms or dropping the piano lessons or putting off the long-awaited family vacation.

Mr. Chairman, how can Congress ask the American people to tighten their belts another inch when they already know the sad truth that higher taxes leads to greater spending—not deficit reduction.

So when we talk about sacrifice, contribution, and patriotism, let's not forget how devastating a tax hike will be to working Americans across this great country.

Let us make those sacrifices and contributions through spending cuts—not taxes. That will be a true act of patriotism for every Member here.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. KASICH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO].

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address an issue that seems to have completely or partially escaped notice by this body or by the press, therefore our constituents are also completely uninformed.

I am speaking, Mr. chairman, of the 12 years of missed opportunities by this body. Twelve years and millions of dollars worth of work to study, create, and propose methods to eliminate the Federal deficit and balance the budget. I have taken the liberty of bringing several samples to the floor today to illustrate my point.

I have here a book by Alice Rivlin, President Clinton's Deputy Director of the OMB. Written in 1984, this proposal, entitled "Economic Choices," has more meat to it than that proposed by Mr. Clinton.

I am now holding up a copy of a February 1981 CBO report entitled "Reducing the Federal Budget: Strategies and Examples, Fiscal Years 1982-86." This document stresses the reduction of Government spending including infrastructure projects, like highway programs. Let me read the preface to you:

This report was written in response to a request by twelve members of the House Budget Committee—Robert N. Giaimo, Chairman of the Committee for the 96th Congress, James R. Jones, Chairman of the Committee for the 97th Congress, Barber B. Conable, Jr., Bill Frenzel, Richard A. Gephardt, Delbert L. Latta, Norman Y. Mineta, Bill Nelson, Leon E. Panetta, Ralph S. Regula, Paul Simon, and Timothy E. Wirth—for a report on the possible strategies that could lead to a reduction in the size of the federal budget.

The CBO Director at that time was Alice Rivlin.

And not unlike these books, I have book after book, recommendation after recommendation, all for obtaining the same objective, to eliminate the Federal deficit.

These reports including this 1985 "Compendium of GAO's Views on the Cost Savings Proposals of the Grace Commission."

For 12 years this body has denied the American people any real fiscal responsibility while, all the time it was right here. Right here under our noses volumes and volumes of ideas that would work. They are both Republican and Democrat. And for 12 years, while all of these proposals sat in unanswered waiting, while the years of uncontrolled spending continued. The fiscal dilemma of this Government is not the result of poor administrative policy, rather it is the result of 12 years of unbridled, arrogant, spending at the expense of the American middle class. The same middle class that President Clinton—the Democrat leaders—take more money from.

I would like to offer my support to the Republican counter proposal authored by my colleague, Mr. KASICH. I also want to point out my agreement with my distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], that the U.S. Government has absolutely no problem raising revenues. Federal revenues have nearly tripled in 10 years to \$1.2 trillion.

There is no need to raise taxes. The only thing we need to do is reduce and control the spending of the Federal Government. I urge support of Mr. KASICH's plan. I also urge America and this body to read the fine print: The only failed economic policy the last 12 years is that Congress cannot control spending.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just indicate, Mr. Chairman, that I have a note that suggests that earlier on limiting travel at the end of the year would save \$300 million, which is a good suggestion, one of the problems, frankly, is that in relationship to how the minority budget is structured, 60 percent of that savings would come in DOD. And as I understand the minority proposal, you could only make 10 percent of the savings out of DOD.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, let me first thank Chairman SABO for yielding me this time and to congratulate him on a job very well done. This, of course, is his floor debut as chairman of our committee, and it has been handled very adroitly, and I appreciate the gentleman's leadership; and also to commend my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for also making his debut. And while the gentleman may not win his battle today, he has done his job admirably.

I could quarrel, and will slightly, with the gentleman from Ohio's offering. I think in function 400, according to Budget Committee data, there is a 60-percent cut in mass transit operat-

ing assistance in the gentleman's proposed budget and a 50-percent cut in mass transit capital assistance which for us in Louisville, KY, is quite devastating.

Also in function 450, which is community and regional development, the budget data suggest that community development block grants would be cut by \$500 million, and the community development banks, which we are getting into at home, would be severely limited.

So I certainly support the offering of the gentleman from Minnesota, our chairman, and oppose that of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

I think it is important to note that there is in the committee bill \$510 billion of Federal spending cuts by the year 1997. It reduces the Federal deficit by over \$140 billion in that same period of time, and I think it is important to note that the budget numbers used are Congressional Budget Office numbers, which are less optimistic, more pessimistic, than some of the data which could have been used, which means that we have real numbers for a change. We can actually rely upon this data.

I am also told that there is in the near years a \$1 to \$1 spending cut to tax increase ratio in order to yield these budget savings, and in the out years the ratio is \$1.5, actually slightly more, \$1.5 of cuts to taxes.

So I think what we have here in the budget is an acknowledgment of what the American people have told us. They want spending cuts more so than they want tax increases, and that is embodied in this bill, \$2 of every \$3 raised, whether it is raised by cuts or in tax increases, goes toward deficit reduction.

All in all, this is a good investment package, this is a good savings package. Let us adopt the committee bill and oppose and defeat the Kasich amendment.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich budget and compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the members of his committee for their hard work. I disagree with some of the specifics, but unlike the Democrat alternative, it is specific.

What it demonstrates is that we can effectively attack the deficit without raising taxes, and, therefore, without hurting the economy.

If we adopt the Kasich budget, we will at least have an opportunity, a viable concept for deficit reduction and economic growth. We will later have plenty of chances to make specific changes in the authorization and appropriation bills.

One reason the Kasich budget is preferable to the committee budget is because it is infinitely more sensible in

the way it cuts defense. Kasich demonstrates that defense can be cut. It cuts defense over 5 years by \$76 billion. The committee/Clinton budget would slash defense by \$127 billion over this same time. That would be irresponsible. Within a year or two we would have to reverse course.

Do not take my word for it. Listen to one of the most respected congressional experts on defense, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], chairman of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, who today is quoted in the Washington Times as saying that we can't get by for more than 1 year without either spending more money or having a hollow force. That phrase echoes ominously from the Carter administration.

Today, we heard testimony in the Armed Services Committee confirming that even now, we are seeing signs of the hollow-force problem. We are stretched so thin that even a relatively small and benign operation like our help in Somalia has left us unable to maintain Navy training tempo in the Pacific. Similarly, we are allowing some key Army divisions to go undermanned because the pace of the drawdown has caused dislocations. We just have to keep our fingers crossed that these divisions are not needed while they remain undermanned.

Cutting defense, Mr. Chairman, is a serious business. It must be done responsibly. The Democrat budget fails that test. The Kasich budget approaches the issue seriously and responsibly. It is another reason to support the Kasich budget.

Mr. Chairman, ending gridlock seems to mean something different in Washington than it does everywhere else in America.

When the American people talk about ending gridlock, they mean that Members of Congress and the President should put aside partisan differences and produce real solutions to the Nation's problems.

In Washington, ending gridlock means going along to get along. And, let's be clear that going along with the budget resolution before us today will get President Clinton and some Members of Congress the additional funds they need to pay for their favorite programs, but it will also get the American people higher taxes, bigger budget deficits, and a weaker economy.

President Bush negotiated a similarly bad deal in 1990, and I voted against it. Partisanship wasn't an excuse to support bad policy then, and it is not the reason to oppose the Clinton plan now. The reason to oppose the Clinton plan is that it is flawed and won't work.

Problem No. 1: It is weighted far too heavily toward tax increases. The Clinton budget calls for the largest tax increase in American history, including higher taxes on Social Security benefits and a new energy tax that violates the President's pledge not to raise taxes on the middle class. So much for tax fairness.

Problem No. 2: Defense and agriculture are about the only parts of the budget that would actually be cut, by nearly \$40 billion, 14 per-

cent and \$10 billion, 50 percent respectively. By 1997, defense will have been cut 37 percent since 1985 alone, and defense as a share of gross national product will amount to less than at any time since Pearl Harbor. Other spending will actually increase by about \$350 billion, or nearly 24 percent, by fiscal year 1998 under the Clinton plan. So much for spending cuts.

In response to the Congressional Budget Office's criticism that the Clinton program falls more than \$60 billion short of the originally claimed savings and receipts, the Budget Committee calls for \$63 billion in unspecified miscellaneous spending cuts. So much for specifics.

Problem No. 3: The President's own Office of Management and Budget [OMB] projects that the deficit will fall by only \$50 billion by 1998—from the Congressional Budget Office's estimated \$291 billion in fiscal year 1994 to \$241 billion in fiscal 1998—and then continue to rise thereafter. So much for deficit reduction.

Problem No. 4: The Clinton plan will cause the economy to falter just as it is beginning to recover. According to the National Center for Policy Analysis, the plan will lower capital formation in the United States by \$1.8 trillion through 1998; and, as a result, economic growth is projected to be almost half a percentage point lower than it would otherwise be. That translates into 1.4 million fewer jobs created over the next 5 years.

Because the Clinton plan will cause slower growth, the average American family will find itself worse off. The National Center estimates that economic loss to equal more than \$1,000 for every man, woman and child in the country.

Mr. Chairman, during the last several weeks, my office has been flooded with phone calls, postcards and letters urging Congress to cut spending first. We have an alternative that would do just that. The Kasich budget includes detailed spending cuts that would produce \$429 billion in deficit reduction over 5 years without any tax increases. No one is going to like every spending cut proposed, but it represents the only option for real change and the only option that gets to the root cause of the deficit problem—excessive Government spending.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Clinton budget and support the Kasich alternative.

□ 1610

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I came here 12 years ago with Ronald Reagan, and I hope the American people have not forgotten the mess we had to clean up the last time the Democrats had control of both Houses of Congress and the Presidency. We had the highest interest rates and the highest inflation of any time in this century. We had a lower growth rate and a higher unemployment rate than we have right now.

It took a lot of time and effort for the Republicans to get spending under control and to reduce the increase in

taxes that the American people were always facing.

Now, we have that same proposal again from the Democrats. Basically we have the Democrats in control of both Houses of Congress and the Presidency, and they are coming back with the same Carteresque proposals.

The reason the economy faltered 12 years ago, or 14 years ago under the Democrats was not because of Jimmy Carter's stupid smile, and it was not corrected because of Ronald Reagan's personality. It was because of the policies of low taxes and responsible spending policies that gave us the chance in the 1980's to expand.

President Bush gave in to the Democrats 2 years ago and agreed to a tax increase, a Democratic tax increase, which knocked the legs out from under our economy.

The Democrats are now using that as an excuse to even have further tax increases and further spending increases.

I say vote for the Kasich budget. Let us go back to the good old days of growth rather than the really bad old days of Jimmy Carter.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, what we are experiencing here today, make no mistake about it, is the fallacy of Reaganomics, the chickens coming home to roost 12 years later, the fallacy of the Reagan program that somehow you could cut taxes, increase spending, and never have to pay the piper.

Well, this is now the moment of truth. My friend, the previous speaker, just spoke about Reagan budget plans. May I remind him that under those two great conservative Presidents, Reagan and Bush, we have had more budget deficits than we have had in the previous 200-and-some-odd years of the United States of America. So when we talk about fiscal responsibility, let us put it where it is, and let us put the responsibility where it is as well.

We talk about balanced budgets. Twelve years of Reagan and Bush, not once did the President submit a balanced budget to the U.S. Congress. We talk about cuts, and we know that it is not true that you can get this budget deficit down solely by cutting programs.

Everyone wants somebody else's program to be cut. Everyone wants programs from the other region of the country to be cut. The fact of the matter is that we need to have a reasonable and balanced program, and that is why I rise in strong support of the Clinton budget proposal, House Concurrent Resolution 64, and in opposition to the Kasich substitute.

This is the first time since I have been in Congress that a President has offered a bold economic program for the country. Under House Concurrent

Resolution 64, the deficit would be reduced by \$510 billion over the next 5 years, and I commend the chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], and the Committee on the Budget for adding \$63 billion in additional cuts to the President's plan.

We face serious economic problems today because we have spent the last dozen years avoiding the growing budget deficit.

I commend President Clinton for changing the debate on the Federal budget deficit from smoke and mirrors to a realistic approach to deficit reduction.

Many political groups from across the political spectrum are supporting the budget proposal issued by the President and the Committee on the Budget. Alan Greenspan, a Republican appointee, for one, says it is going in the right direction. The Wall Street Journal ran a front-page article which reported that three conservative University of Michigan economists predict a stronger economy and a shrinking Federal deficit if the President sticks to his plan. They forecast growth of 3.2 percent this year and 2.3 percent growth in 1994. Additionally, they predict a reduction of the Federal deficit to \$275 billion in fiscal year 1993, and in fiscal year 1995, the deficit could fall below \$175 billion, which is more than \$50 billion below where it would be without the proposed changes today.

There are no quick fixes to our economic problems. It took us 12 years to crawl into this, and it will take us a long time to crawl out of it.

But the easy vote today in the short term, voting for the Clinton plan, is the easy vote in the long term, because making difficult decisions today will build a better future tomorrow.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, for our final speaker, I yield the remainder of our time, 2 minutes, to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to speak on behalf of the Democratic notion of fairness before the House today.

When our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that they want less Government, we need to listen very carefully and hear between their lines.

The American people gave the Republicans 12 years to demonstrate what their kind of leadership means.

The American people voted against them because their record of leadership is very clear.

Republican leadership resulted in the largest budget deficits in our country's history; negative growth in the income of average American families; a decline in child nutrition, health care, housing, and job training.

On the other side, however, Republican leadership also resulted in the enrichment of the military industrial complex and a startling increase in in-

come for those in the top 1 percent of family income groups in this country.

There were very clear winners and losers during the last 12 years of Republican helmsmanship.

It is very clear that Government served the needs of a few of us at the expense of the rest of us.

So the central issue that we must hear between their lines is not about big Government or little Government, but whom that Government is to serve.

Our Nation's budget is a political document that reflects our national priorities—and there are clear winners and losers. But it ought to, as well, be a moral document.

A document that says that we will care for our children; that we will train our youth; that we will prepare our young adults for life that is good and full and productive. And, also, that we will care for our seniors.

Most importantly, Government ought to say to every American child and adult that their talents are wanted and needed.

The budget is where the rubber meets the road. Do we care about diversity? Then we level the playing field so all can participate fully.

Do we care about our children and their education? Then we immunize our children, give them a head start, and teach them to yearn to learn, and then allow them to learn and earn.

Do we care about providing jobs and protecting our environment and just plain old setting a new moral tone in this Country?

We get no relief from the Kasich plan. By contrast, Mr. KASICH is up to the same old time-tested, vote-tested Republican tricks of the past—even cutting food aid for the poor, the WIC Program, legal aid, and community development block grants.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat the Kasich plan, because the Republicans just do not get it.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes, the balance of my time, to the Republican leader, the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich substitute, and I have to say at the very outset that I have been somewhat amused at the criticism being leveled by the big guns on the Democratic side of the aisle against the Kasich proposal, rather than touting their own budget that is supposed to reflect all this change in direction, mandated by the American people's vote for the Clinton administration.

Here you are with an 83-vote majority in this House, and you have to devote most of your time criticizing our plan rather than touting your own. Why are you so reluctant to talk about all of those goodies involved in your increased spending? Is it because, to be credible, you have to also talk about

all the taxes necessary to fund this level of spending, and that real deficit reduction will have to wait for another day?

We acknowledge that we cannot play Santa Claus here today and have to face up to reality.

Cuts have to be made in a number of sensitive areas, or all of the rhetoric about reducing the size of government has a very hollow ring.

This is, indeed, a defining moment between the two parties, the Democratic Party's approach, and our Republican Party's approach.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and our budgeteers have shown clearly that significant, specific cuts, can be made and the deficit significantly reduced without raising taxes.

□ 1620

Now, some will say budgets are only political documents, so why bother with the specifics? But you cannot get to the whole without adding up the sum of the parts.

Mr. Chairman, we are proud of our work product, and that is why we offer it as a substitute. Admittedly, this debate on a budget resolution may only be about choosing which road we intend to follow to get us where we want to go through the balance of this year. The real work will be done in the trenches of our committees over the next few months by way of reconciliation and appropriations bills.

You on the Democratic side have the votes to beat us down today, but this is not the end of the fight; it is just the beginning.

We have a long, long way to go. And every step of the way, we Republicans will be reminding the American people that the Democratic majority prefers to raise taxes on practically everyone and Republicans do not. Run away from that fact, if you can. Deny it, if it makes you feel better for a time. Pound the drums of class warfare loudly, if that sort of nonsense appeals to you. But, sooner or later, the American people are going to see through it all.

And to my fellow Republicans, in conclusion, I say: The President challenged us to come up with specific cuts. I do not believe he thought we could or would do it. But he underestimated our tenacity and our ability to do just that. Mr. KASICH and all my friends on our side on the Committee on the Budget, stalwart members of that Committee on the Budget, met that challenge brilliantly. We can do no less than support them wholeheartedly with our votes for the Kasich substitute here this afternoon.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget proposed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

He and his colleagues on the Budget Committee met President Clinton's challenge to come to the table with alternatives, and their efforts deserve recognition.

I regret that I cannot support the budget proposed by President Clinton. While the President does propose spending reductions, they are modest in comparison to the new taxes he would levy. It is this imbalance that makes it impossible for me to vote for the Clinton plan.

The Kasich plan, in comparison, attacks the deficit by reducing Federal spending.

Radio commentator Paul Harvey struck a chord in my area of Pennsylvania when he urged people to pass on three words of advice to their representative in Congress: "cut spending first."

The Kasich plan does just that. It actually makes the difficult choices we have been talking about for the past decade. I do not agree with each and every spending decision in the plan, but, on the whole, it is even-handed.

Beyond spending cuts, the Kasich plan calls for new user fees to offset the cost of some services, but it does not impose new taxes. While I am not unwilling to consider new taxes, the Btu tax proposed by the administration is unacceptable. The burden imposed by such a tax would fall disproportionately on energy producing States, such as Pennsylvania, and on retirees who are living on fixed incomes.

Finally, the Kasich plan calls for long overdue management reforms, such as performance-based budgeting, that will help to ensure that taxpayers dollars are not wasted through mismanagement.

I urge support for the Kasich alternatives.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Republican Budget Committee's alternative. The Democrats challenged the Republicans to develop an alternative proposal with specific spending cuts. Mr. Chairman, we on the Budget Committee rose to that challenge and developed a plan with real spending cuts, in fact, our plan calls for \$429 billion in cuts over five years without new taxes and without touching Social Security benefits.

The Democrat's budget proposal calls for the largest tax increase in history, more government, more spending, and fewer jobs. Deficits are reduced by controlling spending, not by increasing taxes and domestic spending as President Clinton and my friends on the other side of the aisle would have you believe. The Republican plan is a real alternative, with no new taxes, less government, more jobs, and more take-home pay.

Since President Clinton announced his economic proposal on February 17, 1993, my office has been flooded with thousands of telephone calls, letters, and postcards from Americans who want to see Congress cut spending first before raising taxes. Mr. Chairman, the American people are tired of bearing the burden of tax increases to pay for wasteful government programs. It is time that Congress take a long hard look at government programs and learn to make sacrifices and budget cuts as the American public has done for years.

In response to our constituents, the Republican proposal will save the typical American family earning \$34,000 in after-tax income from paying \$488 more annually in Federal taxes. The Republican plans has no tax increases on energy or consumption and lets the 2.5 cents a gallon gasoline tax expire in

1995 as scheduled. Therefore, take-home pay is increased, not decreased for the average family.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are calling for change in Congress. President Clinton is asking the Federal bureaucracy to scale back 112,000 jobs and take about \$33 billion in administrative savings. The Republican alternative cuts 162,000 jobs in the bureaucracy, cuts Government overhead \$49 billion over 5 years, calls for a 15-percent cut in spending for both legislative and executive branches, and freezes COLA's for Representatives and Senators as well as other Federal workers.

In addition, the Republican plan calls for several commonsense reforms. One example is in regards to social programs. We suggest combining WIC and other food and nutrition programs into WIC-Plus and funding it through block grants to States. Twelve percent of the allocated block grant moneys must go to WIC, but States are given flexibility, the flexibility they need to allocate funds to the programs which show the greatest need. WIC-Plus should serve as a model of reform for other social service programs by combining programs which often overlap, thus best utilizing Government resources and eliminating needless waste.

In regards to national defense, the Republican Budget Committee proposal reduces defense by about \$60 billion as opposed to the Democrat plan which reduces national defense by \$122 billion over 5 years with no real plans for achieving these cuts. The Republican plan cuts foreign aid programs by more than \$13 billion instead of the Democrat proposed cut of only \$3.1 billion over 5 years. The Republican plan also provides for greater burdensharing on the part of our transatlantic allies.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican proposal is less costly to the elderly than the Democrats' proposal. Our plan on this side of the aisle would cut Medicare outlays by \$73 billion by means testing a portion of Medicare for seniors with incomes over \$100,000 which is only fair. On the other hand, the combined Medicare and Social Security tax increase suggested by the Democrats totals \$85 billion over 5 years. The Democrat plan achieves most of their Medicare savings on higher part B premiums that impact seniors in all income brackets.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to share some of the reforms that the Republican Budget Committees' health care working group has suggested. As I have already pointed out, our plan calls for a reduction in Medicare outlays of \$73 billion over 5 years and includes a policy to lower malpractice costs thus allowing reimbursement rates to be held constant for 1 year. We also call for coinsurance on home health care and clinical lab services for beneficiaries, increasing cost consciousness in the Medicare system. The health care working group would also like to implement many of the policy reforms suggested by the Republican leader's task force on health. These reforms call for comprehensive health care reform and adopting the Action Now Health Care Reform Act.

In closing, I would again like to point out that in this era of economic recovery, it is im-

perative that Congress cut spending first before raising taxes. The American people are tired, tired of wasteful government spending, tired of more taxes, and tired of being ignored. They have repeatedly asked for Congress to listen to their concerns and cut spending first. The Republicans have heard the people and our proposal cuts spending first. Mr. Chairman, I ask my friends on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting the Republican committee's budget alternative.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to express my opposition in the strongest terms to the proposal being offered today by Bill Clinton and the Democrat majority in Congress.

The budget proposal offered by the Democrats is a recipe for economic and fiscal disaster. It proposes to increase taxes at a time when Americans are already overtaxed. It proposes to increase taxes at a time when we have a fragile economy—higher taxes will only stifle job creation and economic growth. It proposes to continue the path of excessive government spending—excessive spending is the reason our Federal Government is currently saddled with a massive debt.

Depending on whose estimates you believe, Bill Clinton is proposing to raise taxes anywhere from \$250 billion to \$315 billion. No matter which figure you use, if his proposal becomes law, it will be the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation. Moreover, regardless of the exact figures, his proposal taxes everyone from the small business owner, to the Social Security recipient, to the working middle income American family. And we thought Mr. Clinton was only going to sock it to the rich.

It is an absolute outrage that a man who actually promised middle American taxpayers a tax cut during the campaign can now turn around and unblushingly propose to raise taxes in a magnitude of historic proportions. Mr. Clinton's assertion that the reason he must now raise taxes is because the deficit figure is higher than he anticipated during the campaign is, quite frankly, bull. In fact, last July during the campaign, Clinton predicted even higher deficits—up to \$400 billion—than actually materialized. Moreover, Democrat Budget Committee members advising Clinton during the campaign, and working with their good friends at the Congressional Budget Office [CBO], certainly were well aware of what to expect in the way of deficit figures. Most conspicuous among those members is Leon Panetta, former chairman of the House Budget Committee and now Clinton's Director of Office of Management and Budget [OMB]. For Clinton to rationalize raising taxes based on claims of new deficit figures is the height of hypocrisy. This is just another example of Mr. Clinton trying to be slick.

More importantly, regardless of what the actual deficit figures are, it is excessive spending not insufficient tax revenues that has produced our gushing red ink. Indeed, when you combine Federal, State, and local taxes, you find that the American taxpayer is already being taxed at all-time record high levels. Analyzing the Federal budget over the past 12 years further drives home the point. In 1980 revenues to the Federal Treasury were \$500 billion. By 1992, revenues had soared to \$1.1 trillion—a

massive \$600 billion increase in 12 years. In other words, in 12 years the American taxpayer shouldered an additional Federal tax burden that was greater than the magnitude of the entire tax burden it took us over 200 years to reach.

One would think that the Federal Government could do just fine with \$600 billion in new tax dollars each year, but alas it isn't enough to quench the insatiable thirst of Democrats in Congress. During that same timeframe, Federal expenditures rose from \$600 billion to nearly \$1.4 trillion—an increase of \$800 billion. This simply illustrates the historical fact that for every new dollar the Treasury receives in taxes, Congress spends \$1.60 more. Indeed, the 1990 budget deal which had promised spending cuts for every dollar in new taxes, instead resulted in Congress spending an additional \$2.37 for every dollar in new taxes.

Republicans have been willing to make the hard choices and make the spending cuts. How many times in the past 12 years have I seen this Congress, on a party line vote, reject Republican amendments to trim as little as 1 percent from an appropriation bill. How many times have I seen the Democrat-controlled Rules Committee decide to prevent Republicans from offering amendments to cut spending and make economies.

Indeed, in that regard I was deeply disappointed that the Democrats did not allow my good friend from Indiana, Congressman DAN BURTON, to offer his budget freeze proposal. I have long been an advocate of an across the board spending freeze. Mr. BURTON's proposal would have made a bigger dent in the deficit than any of the proposals before us today. Moreover, in my view, Mr. BURTON's across-the-board freeze is the fairest way to spread the burden of spending cuts—everyone who benefits from Federal spending must tighten the belt. However, once again, in an abuse of their uninterrupted control of the House of Representatives for the past 40 years, the Democrats decided to gag the opposition rather than debate a viable alternative on its merits.

Republicans have proposed viable alternatives and the budget proposal offered by my good friend, JOHN KASICH, is the kind of proposal that the American public deserves. It proposes no tax increases and will cut the deficit significantly. I can only hope that there are Democrats in the House that can see the error of Mr. Clinton's ways and join Republicans in supporting the Kasich budget.

Mr. Chairman, Bill Clinton has broken his promise to the American people as he has broken so many other promises in his short tenure. Mr. Clinton does not understand one basic fact—Americans are not undertaxed—Congress is spending too much. In my view, Bill Clinton sold the American voter a bill of goods. I am afraid that this President, who received only 43 percent of the popular vote, and this Congress, do not understand the nature of the problem. As Bill Clinton should say "It's spending, stupid."

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kasich budget proposal. It is a bold plan and is clearly the best choice to reduce spending and the budget deficit.

The Republican plan is detailed and specific and best of all it reduces the deficit by \$429

billion over 5 years without raising taxes, without touching Social Security, without slashing defense and without crippling the economy. The Republican plan is a plain commonsense approach of cutting spending by eliminating outdated programs and reforming or reducing many others.

The Republican proposal reforms Medicaid, public housing, foreign aid programs, the medical malpractice system, and child nutrition programs. The plan also reduces funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Arts and Humanities, the Bureau of the Census, and reduces mass transit operating subsidies. The Republican package eliminates unnecessary Government agencies like the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Travel and Tourism Administration. Further, the plan cancels the advanced solid rocket motor, halts acquisitions of crude oil for the SPR, and imposes a 5-year moratorium on all Federal land purchases. Finally, the plan includes deep cuts in Federal overhead, personnel and travel costs. The plan is good policy and deserves our vigorous support.

I am opposed to the Democratic budget resolution. It is as my Republican colleagues on the House Budget Committee said, a "formula for failure" because it resorts to tax increases to reduce the deficit. The Sabo substitute relies heavily on President Clinton's spending priorities and assumes his proposals for tax increases. While the budget resolution does not enact or fund any of the President's proposals, it sets the aggregate numbers to guide the decisions that will be made in the months ahead.

The Democratic package includes \$316 billion in tax increases, one of the largest tax increases in history; \$186 billion in Government spending increases on favored domestic programs, \$112 billion in undefined defense cuts, \$156 billion in nondefense cuts, for a total of \$362 billion in deficit reduction.

I object to the new taxes not only because I am convinced that Congress will spend the tax revenue, but because raising taxes by \$316 billion I fear will stifle the weak economic recovery. Employers who will be hit with higher taxes under Clinton's plan will have to cut costs and that probably means laying off employees—making the 7.1 percent unemployment rate even worse. Fewer workers mean fewer people paying taxes and Government spending more scarce tax dollars on unemployment benefits. Also taking money out of the pockets of consumers in the form of higher income and energy taxes will mean they have less to spend and invest. That will have an adverse effect on economic growth.

While the economy has been sluggish for the past 18 months, there are positive signs of economic recovery. The last thing we need are policies that raise taxes and increase Government regulation and spending. Economic growth is promoted by reducing Federal controls on private sector production, income and wealth creation, not by higher taxes. President Clinton's plan will hamper job creation and economic expansion by increasing the tax burden on all income groups and raising deficit spending on additional Government programs.

Finally, after conclusion of debate on the budget resolution, the House will take up the stimulus package. I believe we should not spend the \$16.3 billion on the short-term eco-

nomic stimulus package. This spending is largely in the form of Government make-work jobs that in the short run will drive up the deficit, and in the long run will not create lasting jobs. We would be better off to reduce the Federal deficit by an additional \$16.3 billion.

The President is supposed to be looking for ways to reduce the deficit—estimated to be \$327 billion—and instead has found a way to add over \$16 billion in new deficit spending. Such spending is unnecessary and expensive and will result in very few jobs. There are roughly 13 programs in this bill that do not create any jobs and there are another 16 programs that create jobs at a cost of \$200,000 or more per job. Obviously, jobs are not the main purpose of this spending program. The OMB Director, Leon Panetta, claims the bill will create 219,000 jobs. At \$16.3 billion in total spending, each new job will cost \$89,041 per job. As the Republican members of the Appropriation Committee pointed out, the private sector created 219,000 jobs in 17 days in February, when the economy generated an estimated 345,000 jobs in 1 month and at no cost to the Federal Government.

The so-called stimulus package is loaded with pork and includes many non-emergency spending programs all of which will be added to the deficit. Some examples of non-emergency spending include \$148 million for IRS tax system modernization, \$100 million for a variety of energy conservation programs and activities, \$28 million for the District of Columbia to reduce its debt, \$800,000 to begin preparing for whitewater canoeing at the 1996 Olympics, \$560,000 for air circuit breakers and rest room repairs, and \$19.8 million for an overseas vaccination program for children.

I am opposed to excessive spending at a time when our first priority should be reducing the budget deficit.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich substitute amendment to the fiscal year 1994 budget resolution because it attacks our Nation's budget deficit at the heart of the problem—that is reducing Government spending rather than raising taxes and revenues.

Before discussing the specific details of the various budget proposals before us today, it is important to keep in mind that the budget resolution is a nonbinding document that is not even signed into law by the President. It simply sets spending and revenue targets for the Appropriations, authorizing, and Ways and Means, and Finance Committees of the House and Senate. None of the assumptions of any of these amendments is binding on the House or Senate. In fact, regardless of what happens with these resolutions today, the real work of the House and Senate to reduce the Federal budget deficit is just beginning and will require many long debates and difficult votes in the weeks ahead.

Also it is important to remember that no member will completely agree with every assumption or recommendation made in any of these budget proposals. In making my decision on which amendments to support, I look at the basic tenants and philosophies each uses to achieve our overall goal of reducing the Federal budget deficit. In the case of the Kasich amendment, the substitute budget offered by the Republican members of the

Budget Committee, I support the goal of reducing the deficit strictly through cutting spending without raising revenues.

For far too long, every revenue increase approved by Congress with the intent of reducing the budget deficit has actually increased Federal spending and consequently added to the deficit. This tax-and-spend philosophy is what helped drive our Nation into debt and for which we are now paying almost \$300 billion per year in interest on the accumulated national debt. This interest payment has accounted for more than 75 percent of the increase in our national debt over the past 12 years.

In comparing the budget resolution reported by the committee to the Kasich amendment, there are a number of glaring differences. The committee recommends \$316 billion in tax increases over the next 5 years, which the Congressional Budget Office estimates will cost families with after-tax incomes of \$34,000 an additional \$500 a year more in Federal taxes.

The Kasich amendment calls for no new income, gasoline, or energy taxes and it does not accept the recommendation by President Clinton to increase the tax rate on Social Security benefits.

Through spending reductions alone, the Kasich amendment would reduce the 1994 budget deficit by \$38 billion—more than twice the reduction recommended by President Clinton—and would provide for \$430 billion in deficit reduction over the next 5 years—\$70 billion more than the proposal by President Clinton.

The two budget resolutions also differ greatly on how to reduce Federal spending. The package recommended by President Clinton calls for \$156 billion in nondefense budget cuts versus \$370 billion in nondefense budget cuts in the Kasich budget over the next 5 years. President Clinton recommends \$112 billion in defense cuts over the same time period, double the amount recommended in the more responsible Kasich budget.

The budget alternatives before us also take extremely different approaches to reducing U.S. foreign aid payments with the Kasich amendment recommending \$13 billion in cuts over the next 5 years, versus the \$7 billion recommended by President Clinton. Specifically, I strongly support two major cuts in foreign aid included in the Kasich amendment. The first would save \$1 billion over 5 years by withholding any future U.S. contributions to the World Bank and other multilateral development banks which, as I have called attention to for many years, have a history of making questionable and unsound loans to foreign nations—often times our adversaries—which will never be repaid. The second recommendation is that the United States also withhold any future contributions to the International Development Association, or IDA, over the next 5 years, resulting in savings of more than \$5.5 billion. IDA is the World Bank affiliate which makes low-interest loans to the poorest of nations, many which have the world's worst domestic policies and human rights records.

Domestically, the Kasich amendment recommends that the Federal Government set an example for reducing spending by saving \$100 billion over the next 5 years through reduced Federal bureaucracy and overhead expenses. It would reduce Federal employment by

162,000 civilian positions over the next 5 years, 50,000 more than recommended by President Clinton. It also reduces the budget for the operations of the legislative branch by more than 15 percent, a figure which I believe could be increased to 25 percent or more.

Finally, the Kasich amendment has less of an impact on older Americans than President Clinton's proposal. The Kasich amendment recommends no increased taxes on Social Security benefits, as included in the President's plan. It also does not increase Medicare part B premiums for all older Americans, as recommended by the chairman of the Budget Committee. Instead it would initiate a means-testing program for Medicare, which would raise Medicare premiums and deductibles for older Americans with incomes over \$100,000. In the past I have opposed means-testing of the Medicare Program and I believe that this recommendation should be the focus of lengthy congressional hearings before it is brought before the House in any legislation to implement the recommendations approved today.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have spoken out and demanded that Congress work to ensure that the Federal Government learns to live within its means. Many of the people from Pinellas County I represent have applauded President Clinton for putting forth a plan to reduce the budget deficit, but even more have said that although this is a good first step, Congress should go further in reducing spending. The Kasich amendment does just that by significantly reducing spending without raising taxes.

Following consideration of the Kasich amendment, we will consider a second proposal which provides for even greater deficit reduction. The so called Solomon amendment takes the Kasich budget cuts and reduces spending over the next 5 years by another \$38 billion.

The Solomon amendment provides for no increase in taxes on the middle-class families, no energy taxes, and no increase in the taxes paid on Social Security benefits. It does provide for a surtax on quarter-millionaires, a new 36-percent tax rate for joint filers with incomes over \$200,000, and it eliminates the deductibility of compensation over \$1 million for business executives, athletes, and entertainers.

This new revenue is used to pay for the extension of some very important tax incentives that help spur business investment and job creation. These include the permanent extension of the research and development tax credit, the targeted jobs tax credit, and the restoration of the deductibility of losses from passive real estate provisions. The Solomon amendment also provides for a capital gains tax deduction for start-up companies and repeals the luxury tax on boats—a tax which has shut down many of our state's and our Nation's few remaining boat builders.

Finally, the Solomon amendment would require the committees with appropriate jurisdiction to report to the House later this year legislation to provide the President with line-item veto authority over appropriations and authorizing bills and a constitutional amendment providing for a balanced budget amendment.

While I support the Kasich amendment, should it fail I will support the Solomon

amendment. Although it includes revenue increases, there are half as many as recommended by President Clinton, and there are \$38 billion more in spending cuts than the committee bill over the next 5 years.

And as I said before, while I do not agree with every provision of the Solomon amendment, such as the significant cut in space station funding and the consolidation of our Nation's intelligence gathering operations, I believe it serves its purpose in providing a framework for debate which relies much more on spending cuts than the President's budget.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I want to express my serious concerns about the procedure under which we consider these budget resolutions today. We are being asked to vote on a budget resolution today which is based upon a package which President Clinton will not formally submit to Congress for another 2½ weeks. We are also being asked to vote on a budget resolution today which if implemented would require significant sacrifices by the American people to reduce the Federal budget deficit. Yet, later this evening, we will be asked to consider, without the benefit of amendment, a supplemental appropriations bill that will add \$30 billion to the budget deficit for the current year.

In the 6 months we have until the new fiscal year begins, we must dedicate ourselves to making the tough decisions required to reduce spending and get our fiscal house in order. Gimmicks and rhetoric will not do the job. It will require long hours of genuine debate and a series of difficult votes to enable our Nation to reestablish its budgetary priorities. This is the job the American people have sent us here to do and a responsibility they demand we fulfill.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, during last year's Presidential campaign, candidate Bill Clinton pledged to offer middle-class families \$60 billion in tax cuts over 4 years.

However, after the election, President-elect Clinton decided to teach the middle class a lesson in gullibility.

The President has proposed an estimated \$328 billion in tax increases over 5 years. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the typical family with an after-tax income of \$34,000 will contribute 500 additional dollars a year as their patriotic share of that \$328 billion tax increase.

Last month President Clinton defended his broken tax promise to the middle class by stating that the deficit had increased far beyond his earlier estimates.

However, Mr. Clinton was fully aware in July 1992 of more accurate deficit projections.

On July 6, candidate Bill Clinton told *Business Week* magazine that deficit projections had increased beyond the earlier \$250 billion to \$400 billion.

In reality, the deficit projected today, \$360 billion, is nearly \$40 billion less than Mr. Clinton had projected in July.

So I ask, why the radical change in your plans, Mr. President?

I feel that the President's tax-based approach to reducing the deficit is misguided. We have a deficit because of a number of reasons: for example, excessive regulation and paperwork that requires thousands of unne-

cessary Government officials; billions of dollars of congressional pork projects; and a dominant philosophy in Congress that expensive programs can solve all of our Nation's ills. The only truly effective way for the Federal deficit to be reduced is to put the Government spending machine in reverse. I do not see how taking more money away from Americans is going to make our country a better place.

The President claims that 70 percent of his tax increases will be paid by Americans earning more than \$100,000 a year. What the President neglects to mention is that the \$100,000 is not based on taxable or adjusted gross income. The \$100,000 is in family economic income which includes employer pension contributions and the potential rental cost of a home.

In my district in Connecticut, where the cost of living is higher and homes are worth more, nearly every suburban family will be considered rich under this plan. In fact, according to the independent, nonpartisan Tax Foundation, the residents of the State of Connecticut will suffer more from the Clinton budget than any other State.

Yet the President describes his plan as a deficit reduction plan to gain popular support for his tax increase. Historically, however, tax increases have led to spending increases, not to some new-found responsible management of our Government. The Clinton budget contains no provision to prevent higher tax revenues from being used for more spending. With new tax revenues coming in next year, there will be new apparent opportunities to spend. Do you get the message? Tax and spend.

It's the same old song with a different meaning since Jimmy Carter has been gone.

I support the Kasich plan which offers detailed budget cuts in a credible deficit reduction plan without tax increases.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Mr. KASICH's budget substitute. I do so, even though I do not agree with every specific line item.

First, please let me say that Mr. KASICH, the Republican ranking member on the Budget Committee, has done a great job putting his proposal together. I commend him and his staff for their excellent work.

As we all know, a budget resolution is only a blueprint. It is a map that guides us to our final goal. Before us today we have two competing blueprints. The Kasich plan, which I will from now on refer to as the Republican alternative, and the plan put forth by the President and supported by the Democratic leadership.

Each plan is specific in its own way, however, the Republican alternative is more detailed. Despite these specifics, I believe that the overall blueprint is most important. This is true, since the budget recommendations we pass today still have to go through the authorization and appropriation process. At any time during this procedure, the budget can be altered.

Let me first say that I agree with President Clinton that we need to cut the budget deficit and stimulate economic growth. Despite this mutual goal, however, we disagree on the appropriate solution. While the President advocates higher taxes and increased spending, I believe, as the Kasich plan proved, that the deficit can be cut by reducing spending, not by raising taxes.

This debate and vote today is just the beginning. Throughout the next several months, as we discuss the fiscal future of this great country, I will continue to monitor and fight for the hard working taxpayers of the Third Congressional District of New Jersey. I believe that my constituents deserve more and better jobs, lower taxes, and less government interference. If afforded, they will be able to create a better life for themselves and their families.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich plan because it implements the concept that "the proper solution to spiraling deficits is controlling Federal spending." This plan reduces the Federal deficit by \$38 billion in fiscal year 1994 and nearly \$430 billion over 5 years without tax increases and without touching Social Security.

During January and February of this year, I conducted 17 town hall meetings throughout my western North Carolina district as well as sending a survey in order to listen to the people's opinions on the issues facing this House. I recently received the results of this survey; over 15,000 responses came back to my office, and they were overwhelmingly opposed to higher taxes, demanding that Congress cut spending first. This, too, was the overwhelming sentiment expressed by the hundreds and hundreds of people who attended our town meetings—as well as the thousands of calls, letters, and postcards I have received in the past 2 months.

The people are speaking and it is our duty to represent their views. Because the Kasich plan does not increase taxes, it is an honest effort at deficit reduction and spreads the pain fairly across all areas. The Kasich plan makes government sacrifice—even the Congress—without increasing taxes on the American people to fund more spending, and without touching Social Security.

We simply cannot use budget gimmickry to paper over this crisis. Yet, for over 20 years, we have had so-called deficit-cutting programs that raise taxes and put off spending cuts until the future—the 1990 budget agreement is a prime example of this. Unfortunately, the future never comes. In the last decade, Congress has increased spending \$1.59 for every dollar in increased taxes.

We cannot ask the American people to sacrifice before making the government sacrifice itself. Major American corporations—from IBM to General Motors to Sears & Roebuck—have responded to changes in the marketplace by cutting expenses and becoming more efficient. Before Congress even contemplates raising the American people's taxes it should be obligated to cut the fat from its own budget and make meaningful sacrifice itself. Given its recent history of pay raises, perks, and House bank scandals, Congress needs to adopt a plan to restore its credibility in order to gain the public's support for the tough spending decisions it faces in other parts of the Federal budget. The Kasich plan would save approximately \$48 billion over 5 years by reducing the Federal bureaucracy and restraining the growth of Federal pay and perks. In addition, the Kasich proposal cuts civilian Federal bureaucracy by 162,000 and freezes the COLA for all Federal employees, including Members of Congress.

This plan calls for: First, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution; second, fixed deficit targets; third, enhanced rescission authority for the President; fourth, a seven-point test to help eliminate pork barrel projects; and fifth, allowing taxpayers to check off up to 10 percent of their Federal tax liability to reduce the deficit by contributing to a public debt reduction fund.

In addition to supporting the Kasich proposal, I have proposed a plan to cut legislative branch spending by 25 percent—matching the President's efforts to cut White House staff by an equal amount. My recommendation would cut \$567 million in Congress' \$2.2 billion budget in its first year and save over \$2 billion of the taxpayers' money over 4 years. I plan to offer these cuts as amendments when the Legislative Branch Subcommittee begins to mark up the budget for congressional offices, committees, and support staff.

I urge my colleague to support the Kasich proposal; it achieves meaningful deficit reduction without any tax increases or cuts in Social Security.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 135, noes 295, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

AYES—135

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Condit
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dorman
Dreier
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)

Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodling
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hastert
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Livingston
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum

McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinar
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ridge
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)

Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton

Walker
Walsh
Weldon

Young (FL)
Zelliff
Zimmer

NOES—295

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bellenson
Bentley
Breuter
Berman
Bevill
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehler
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burton
Byrne
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson

Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies
Mezvisinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley

Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rogers
Romero-Barcelo
(PR)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpaluis
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skellton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Sweet
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman

Torres	Vento	Williams
Torricelli	Visclosky	Wilson
Towns	Volkmer	Wise
Trafficant	Vucanovich	Wolf
Tucker	Waters	Woolsey
Underwood (GU)	Watt	Wyden
Unsoeld	Waxman	Wynn
Valentine	Wheat	Yates
Velazquez	Whitten	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—5

Faleomavaega (AS)	Ford (TN) Henry	Quillen Washington
----------------------	--------------------	-----------------------

□ 1644

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Quillen for, with Mr. Washington against.

Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. MINETA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 103-37.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE
OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SOLOMON: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE
BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994.

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990).

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, and October 1, 1997:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$888,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: \$952,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$1,005,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,046,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,096,600,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$10,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: \$18,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$26,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$27,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$27,200,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$93,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: \$104,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$111,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$116,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$122,500,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$1,177,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: \$1,217,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$1,263,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,331,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,408,200,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$1,180,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: \$1,208,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$1,243,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,295,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,369,000,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$234,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: \$186,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$157,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$162,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$180,900,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$4,700,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: \$5,041,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$5,372,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$5,720,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$6,092,900,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, and October 1, 1997, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New direct loan obligations, \$.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1994 through 1998 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, \$262,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$277,130,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, \$260,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$270,390,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, \$258,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$267,170,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$258,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$267,170,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$262,650,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$266,350,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$270,890,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$265,880,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,250,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,620,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,770,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,180,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,590,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$.

(B) Outlays, \$37,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 1994:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 1994:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,170,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,280,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,470,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,470,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,960,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,960,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,250,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,260,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,740,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,550,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 1994:
 (A) New budget authority, \$208,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$208,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$222,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$222,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$234,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$234,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$245,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$245,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$256,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$256,100,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 1994:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,100,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 1994:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,030,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,030,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,730,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,730,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,430,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,430,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than May 1, 1993, the House committees named in subsections (b) through (r) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$3,069,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, \$3,512,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, \$2,944,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, \$3,010,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and \$2,993,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(b) The House Committee on Armed Services shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: \$900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, \$2,010,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, \$1,600,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, \$50,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TAX REVENUES AND DEFICIT REDUCTION.

It is the Sense of Congress that any legislation enacting tax increases called for in this Budget Resolution contain language providing that the next revenues generated by the legislation shall not be counted for the purpose of calculating the amount of any deficit increase called for in Section 252(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 as amended by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

SEC. 6. SPECIAL PROCEDURES.

Pursuant to section 301(b)(4) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, the appropriate committees of the Congress are hereby instructed to report to their respective Houses, not later than May 1, 1993, for the purposes of implementing and enforcing the reductions in spending and deficits as provided for by this resolution, and to be effective for the fiscal years covered by this resolution, the following:

(a) a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget;

(b) legislation giving the President enhanced rescission, line-item veto authority subject to disapproval only by the enactment of a joint resolution of the Congress; and

(c) legislation establishing Maximum Deficit Amounts identical to those contained in this resolution and procedures for triggering sequestration when actual deficits exceed such amounts.

SEC. 7. TAXPAYER DEBT BUY-DOWN.

In order to reduce the deficit in fiscal years 1994 through 1998 by avoiding the debt service cost that attend the public debt by retiring portions of that debt and further reducing the deficit by providing the public with an opportunity to get dollar-for-dollar deficit reduction for each dollar contributed to debt retirement—

(1) the Committee on Ways and Means shall submit recommendations by August 1, 1993, to the House of Representatives—

(A) proposing changes in law to allow taxpayers to designate up to 10% of their income tax liability to reduce the public debt; and

(B) establishing a public debt reduction trust fund in the Treasury of the United States to receive those designated funds to buy back the public debt; and

(2) the Committee on Government Operations shall submit recommendations by August 1, 1993, to the House of Representatives proposing changes in law—

(A) providing automatic annual sequestrations (except social security, interest on the public debt, and deposit insurance) equal to the estimated aggregate amount of money deposited in the public debt reduction trust fund; and

(B) providing Congress with the authority to propose reductions in spending to avoid any across-the-board annual sequestration referred to in subparagraph (A).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, fellow Americans, this is the showdown right now.

I voted for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] like a great many of my colleagues did over here, and I was proud to do so. But now that the Kasich budget is no longer an option to this body, my colleagues should know that this is the very last chance that Democrats and Republicans will have to strip the Clinton proposal.

□ 1650

As I said before, I was proud to vote for the Kasich budget. I am sorry it did not pass. But now that it is no longer an option, this is the very last chance that Democrats on that side and Republicans on this side will have to strip the Clinton proposal of two of the most onerous and unfair taxes that this body could possibly levy on middle-class taxpayers and senior citizens, and that, Mr. Chairman, is the Btu energy tax that will drastically reduce the cost of food and gasoline and home heating fuel and every single piece of manufactured goods in America on our constituents. And it will strip out the Clinton Social Security tax increase that almost doubles the Social Security tax on retired American citizens. You do not want to do that.

Mr. Chairman, why is this the last chance? Because if my amendment is defeated on this floor now, your vote against my amendment guarantees that this unfair energy tax and the unfair Social Security tax will become law, and your vote did it.

Mr. Chairman, if Members want to vote for this Solomon consensus, let me tell what it does.

First of all, this Solomon consensus will not raise taxes one dime. It cuts taxes. The Clinton budget calls for \$366 billion in new taxes, and we in the Solomon consensus cut taxes by \$222 billion, \$222 billion by eliminating the increase in the energy tax, by eliminating the Social Security tax, by eliminating the corporate income tax. And we cut President Clinton's tax increase further by changing his new tax bracket from \$140,000 up to \$200,000 of adjusted gross income before it kicks in. That is a tax cut, not a tax increase.

Mr. Chairman, to stimulate the economy we provide for vital tax incentives. We cut taxes further, not raise them; by extending expiring business tax incentives; by restoring real estate passive loss, that almost bankrupted the real estate industry in this country 6 years ago; by providing capital gains tax deductions for startup companies which is badly needed; and by repealing the luxury tax on boats that most Members on that side of the aisle have sponsored, and just about everybody on this side of the aisle has sponsored. Here is your chance to vote for it, including the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], my good friend.

Mr. Chairman, that cuts \$222 billion out of the Clinton tax increases, leav-

ing only this, Mr. Chairman, and I do not address this, but it leaves in the Clinton budget a surtax on millionaires. It leaves some miscellaneous taxes to plug business expense loopholes and it leaves a limit on deductions for executive pay over \$1 million.

If there is anything that could be construed as an income tax increase in this substitute here, it is this: we expand that limit of \$1 million on executive pay to include movie stars and professional athletes who make 200 times what the average assembly line worker makes at GE in my district or General Motors in your district. Two hundred times.

Mr. Chairman, if Members vote for the Solomon amendment, they remove the middle-class tax increase and put fairness back into the U.S. Tax Code.

Besides fairness, Mr. Chairman, the most important other issue in this budget and facing this Congress and this Nation is reducing the unconscionable deficit that is drowning this Nation in a sea of red ink. Unfortunately, the Clinton budget, even after raising taxes by \$336 billion, does little or nothing to reduce spending or to reduce that deficit. Over 5 years President Clinton's budget only cuts spending \$219 billion, with practically no cuts in the first 2 years and no procedures to guarantee that we get any cuts in the last 3 years. Members know we will not, without Gramm-Rudman restrictions in there.

Mr. Chairman, here is the real difference between the two bills: The Solomon plan more than doubles the Clinton cuts, cutting \$265 billion more than Clinton, and it guarantees those cuts by requiring sequestration procedures that trigger across-the-board cuts if this Congress exceeds these budget limits. These cuts, totaling more than \$485 billion, guarantee that we will reduce the deficit by a whopping \$620 billion. That is \$150 billion more than President Clinton and the Democrat budget over there.

Mr. Chairman, that is real deficit reduction, and it is real tax fairness. Speaking of fairness, remember, as I said in the beginning, this is your absolute last chance to remove the unjust energy tax and the grossly unjust Social Security tax off the backs of the American people who can least afford it.

Mr. Chairman, Members should not let their vote—and I am talking about Democrat Members over there, and their votes over here, Republicans—be the one that saddles these taxes on the American people. If they do they ought to be ashamed of themselves. Members should support this substitute because their constituents will thank them for doing it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to stand and firmly say I rise in opposition to the Solomon amendment. First of all, I want to compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], which I do not do too often. But I want to say to him I think it is an intellectually honest budget in which he admits there had to be some tax increases, and he really does raise taxes to \$150 billion over 5 years. I salute that honesty that is out there.

But the gentleman said make sure you know what your vote is doing.

Mr. Chairman, I know what my vote is doing, and I am going to vote "no" with my vote. But let me tell you why: because I think this amendment kills the seed corn we desperately need in the 1990's to reinvest in this economy to make it go and to get back into the global marketplace.

First of all, I am sorry to see the Solomon amendment on the floor on the day we had CEO's from Fortune 500 companies here having a press conference and having a luncheon with Members of Congress, and pleading with them to focus on America's children, immunizations, Head Start, the feeding program, seeing those as investments in America's future work force.

Mr. Chairman, if you vote for the Solomon amendment, you are ignoring those CEO's. It is wonderful to see CEO's here talking about children, talking about the future, and seeing that as our seed corn and something we need to focus on.

Second, it takes out all the conversion money and all the investment strategies for the future. When it comes to conversion, and I could not mean this more seriously, we are in an adapt or die mode. I think if we do not find a way to do this conversion and to use so much of the technology that we invested in for the military, and that is the majority of what we invested in, we invested for the military, if we do not find a way to apply that in the civilian sector so we can retain a strong technology base, we really are going to harm ourselves vis-a-vis national security.

□ 1700

I think the President of the United States has reached a very important balance on this issue that we all must take very seriously. He has focused on basic research and applied research in these new technologies, talking about information highways, talking about how we throw this stuff over the fence and get it into the civilian sector.

He has talked about energy conservation programs. I am sorry, but we will not get serious about it until we start taxing on it. We have seen that over and over again. And until we work on it, it is not going to happen.

There is all sorts of environmental protection and restoration that this will cut out of his budget that, I think, is terribly important, if we are going to get on, first, with the conversion but, second, also manufacturing things that the world needs.

So this Solomon amendment does a very good job in recognizing the need for cuts. It does a good job in recognizing the need for revenues. He has had the guts to raise taxes. But the thing that I feel very bad about is that he left out the seed corn, and the seed corn are kids, and the Kasich amendment did this, too.

Over and over again, we love children to death till we get them to the budget door, and then we drop them like a hot potato.

Things the President has in this budget are things that this country promised to do 35 years ago. It also leaves out the investment and conversion strategies, and it seems to me that for the average American taxpayer, who invested so heavily in this defense research in the 1980's, it is very important that we make sure this now get out and we do everything we can to make this work.

I would hope that Members would vote against the Solomon amendment, even though, as I say, there are some things in there that he has tried very hard to do, and they should vote against it because we not only need to just look at today, we must look at tomorrow.

Tomorrow is about conversion, investments, the global economy we are in, dealing with the environment, dealing with energy research, all those things we put on hold for over 10 years. If we do not get them back, I worry we will not be players in the 21st century. So the piece that gets us the potential to be a player in the 21st century is missing from the Solomon amendment. Therefore, I will vote "no."

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman mentioning children. I have five children and two grandchildren. One of the things we do that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] will be speaking about in 1 minute is restore the home equity provision, which is going to allow a lot more children to go to college.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me because, in response to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado, I want everyone to know that from 1994 through 1998, under our proposal, there is a \$266 billion increase in revenues through growth. So we have got \$266

billion that we are free to reallocate in this program, however we want. We just use the additional tax revenue for deficit reduction.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Solomon substitute. The principles behind this budget are tax fairness for this generation of taxpayers and even greater deficit reduction for the benefit of our next generation.

Mr. Chairman, I received a letter this week from an 80-year-old widow.

Mr. UPTON: I have recently been made aware of the increase in energy taxes that President Clinton has proposed. As a widow, 80 years of age, I am doing the best I can to live on my meager income. I urge you to vote against the energy taxes that the President is proposing.

You, more than most, are aware that Michigan, in particular, is already hard hit by unemployment and welfare without the additional charges that these energy taxes would bring.

During the hard Michigan winter, I try to tighten my belt so I can afford to heat my home—please, I urge you to propose tightening the administration's belt, too.

We had folks like this widow and her granddaughter, who typed it, in mind when we crafted this budget. And unlike the Clinton budget, we do not ask the overburdened middle class to pay more. And we do not ask anyone to pay more in taxes until we cut spending first.

Let me reiterate that, cut spending first. We cut spending in the first year, Mr. Chairman, by \$42 billion, this compared to the Clinton budget of \$6 billion. And then in the second year, we cut spending by \$71.3 billion, as compared to only \$10.8 billion in the Clinton budget.

That means that totally, we cut spending \$113 billion in the first 2 years of the operation of this budget versus only \$17 billion by the Clinton budget.

We ask only that the people who can afford to pay more in taxes, in fact, pay more. But we ensure that this new revenue will not go to new spending but instead to reduce the deficit. We enforce that promise with specific cut suggestions and a line-item veto, a balanced-budget amendment and automatic sequestration enforcement.

By combining the best of the rest, the spending package of the Kasich committee on the budget, along with \$38 billion in additional cuts of our own and less than half of the President's tax increases, we reduce the deficit by \$170 billion more than the other package.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a copy of the letter to which I referred:

MARCH 8, 1993.

FRED UPTON,
House of Representatives
Washington, DC.

MR. UPTON: I have recently been made aware of the increase in energy taxes that President Clinton has proposed. As a widow, 80 years of age, I am doing the best I can to

live on my meager income. I urge you to vote against the energy taxes that the President is proposing.

You, more than most, are aware that Michigan, in particular, is already hard hit by unemployment and welfare without the additional charges that these energy taxes would bring.

During the hard Michigan winter, I try to tighten my belt so I can afford to heat my home—please, I urge you to propose tightening the administration's belt, too.

Sincerely,

P.S. Thank you to my grand-daughter, Kristen, for typing this letter for me.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise, I am sorry to say, to oppose the Solomon amendment, even though I do want to take note, as my colleague from Colorado, Mrs. SCHROEDER did, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has indeed tried to create something of a coalition and to draw some of us who believe that those who got most out of the 1980's ought to give something back in the 1990's.

I oppose this amendment chiefly because its spending cuts would undermine the impact of any stimulus program. And while I agree with my colleague from Colorado that we need seed corn, the reasons I want to emphasize at this time are somewhat different, much as I agree with the gentlewoman, but I want to stress the need for a stimulus in order to assure that we get out of this recession with a genuine recovery.

Now, some have been trying to have it both ways, Mr. Chairman. They argue that the President's stimulus is too little to matter, and they argue that it is too much in the face of a full recovery. They can speak this doublespeak only if they ignore certain felt economic realities. They have to first ignore the false starts that we have already experienced in this recovery. False starts signal the need for some further stimulation.

Look at the time period of this recession. Technically it went from July 1990 to April 1991. We are almost 2 years into recovery and, yet, out of the last six quarters, in only the most recent one has growth reached the minimum 4 percent that indicates a period of real recovery. That ought to frighten us. It certainly frightens the people whom I represent.

One would further have to ignore yesterday's report that employers are using overtime at a record unmatched since the 1950's. And they are using overtime rather than employing people, which is why we have 9 million people out there saying, "Where is the recovery?"

One would have to ignore the frightening and startling proportion of the recovery that is in part-time jobs with no benefits. In order to assume that no

stimulus is necessary one would have to ignore the missing ingredient in this recovery that has been present in other recoveries, and that is some fiscal policy, tax cuts or spending of some kind that encourages job creation. That is what has been missing in this recovery, and we are feeling it and paying for it.

One would have to ignore, above all, the effects that the President's cuts may have on the recovery itself.

□ 1710

I do not oppose the President's cuts. We have been willing to swallow the President's cuts. We do ask for some balance. We have to ask ourselves, for example, what of the 100,000 Federal jobs the President's attrition program over the next 5 years that will not be available and otherwise would have been available? In the Washington metropolitan region for example 22,000 jobs, would not be available but only half of these jobs, Mr. Chairman, are Federal jobs. The other half are jobs that will not be there in the private sector because of the decline in Federal spending.

The private sector needs a stimulus to pick up the people who are not going to be in the Federal sector because we are going to say to 100,000 of them, "These jobs are no longer available to you."

What of the base closings? Who is going to pick up the 57,000 people put out of work because of the base closings? An unstimulated economy, Mr. Chairman? Only an energetic private sector can pick up these pieces, a private sector that is not afraid to grow, as today's private sector is now; otherwise, business would be bringing people back to work rather than using compulsory overtime.

We must begin the stimulus now in the face of government and private sector cuts, even during a period of supposed growth. I predict that we are going to need more stimulus later, much more, if we do not start now. Leave the President's plan alone. Make jobs, not war, on the floor.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentlewoman, we will not be debating the stimulus plan until much later tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY].

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Solomon substitute.

Mr. Chairman, if we stick to the schedule which was published for today, we are going to be considering a so-called economic stimulus package before we leave here tonight. And I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, because if we pass the budget resolution as originally proposed by the President, we are going to be undercutting whatever we, as Congress, do to stimulate the economy.

That is why I supported the Kasich substitute and, failing its adoption, it is why I support the Solomon compromise substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I recall watching the economic summit which then President-elect Clinton called in December. And, I cannot recall one panelist saying that tax increases are what the country needs to bring it out of the economic doldrums. In fact, it seems almost universally agreed that, while tax hikes provide an easy means to close the deficit, they are almost certain to stall whatever recovery is currently taking place.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believes that tax hikes should be used to close the deficit only as a last resort. And, I agree with the President that, if tax hikes are ultimately necessary, they should fall most significantly on those who can best afford to pay.

By seeking to eliminate taxes which erode the buying power of middle-class Americans, the Solomon substitute permits economic growth and helps the President keep his promise to shield the most Americans from taxes they cannot afford to pay.

For these reasons, I will be voting for the Solomon substitute and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to one of our most knowledgeable Members, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], a former member of the Committee on the Budget for 6 years and a present member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, there is so much I would like to say about this issue. I only have 2 minutes. I think there is one point that I think is overarching here.

I applaud what the President is doing. I applaud the fact that he has taken the torch and shown us the way. The thing that I feel badly about, despite my respect for a lot of people who put in a great deal of work in this budget process, it really does not get us where we want to go.

I really think the American people, they hear the bugles and they expect to see the horses coming over the hill. Frankly, the horses will not be there unless something like the Solomon substitute is enacted. I will tell the Members why. Because at the end of these 5 years the American people will say, "We have got our debt in pretty good shape, our deficit is continuing to go down."

Wrong. Under the proposals which I see now, particularly the proposal on the Democratic side, the deficit begins to creep up and our debt, owned by the public as a percent of our GDP, now is 53 percent and at that time will be 57 percent.

Frankly, the debt is the critical issue. It does not make any difference what the deficit is; it is the means to an end: the debt, the debt that our children are going to inherit. If we end up at the end of 5 years with a debt higher than it is now as a percent of our productive capacity, I think we have led the American people down the wrong road. I urge the Members to support the Solomon substitute, because it is the only plan that gets the type of

numbers we are looking for and does not betray the confidence of the American people in what we are trying to do down here.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Solomon substitute amendment. There is much in this amendment to be found objectionable. Many of the cuts proposed in the earlier unsuccessful amendment are contained in this amendment. I believe that in certain instances these cuts represent in fact tax increases to the recipients of the most unfair kind.

In the earlier amendment I mentioned the Medicare cuts, \$20 billion removed from this program and replaced by higher assessments on Medicare recipients using the laboratory services, receiving home health care, rather than spread any kind of tax obligation on those who have received and have most prospered under our past economic circumstance, rather than spread it broad based over all of this country.

This singles out elderly, sick people and hits them with \$20 billion in additional assessments. For that reason alone I would oppose this amendment.

There is more. Elimination of the Federal Crop Insurance Program, elimination of it at a time when we need to be assisting our agriculture producers in risk management, helping them to avoid catastrophes that are the natural occupational hazard unique to agriculture in this country and around the world, they eliminate the opportunity to ensure against risks. This is not a budget-saving item, this is a proposal which will ensure every single year rural Members of this body will propose specific disaster relief measures, measures that will ultimately be funded off budget, that will impact the deficit the amendment's sponsors speak so passionately about.

Elimination of the Federal crop insurance is yet another bad component of this package, and presents, again, sufficient reason to vote against it. I think there are even more overarching issues at stake.

The economy of this country is sick. It may not be in the depth of the recession at the present time, but its rebound is anything but on schedule for a full, healthy recovery. We are 3 million jobs behind. The Solomon amendment fails most utterly in its failure to acknowledge the fragile and tepid state of our present economic recovery.

The chart before us reflects what really is a guarantee for further recession, if we were to hit 1994 with \$65 billion in spending reduction with not one iota of the investment component proposed in the President's package.

In summary Mr. Speaker, this amendment fails the test. It has specif-

ics, and many of the specifics justify defeat of the amendment. Moreover, it fails to correctly assess the interlinked nature of the deficit reduction and economic recovery. If the economy goes in the tank again, there will not be the economic recovery reflected in this plan, and in fact, the deficit reduction proposed, absent any effort at stimulating a recovery, guarantees renewed recession for this country.

For this reason, I urge the Members of this body to oppose this amendment.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], a major player in the writing and drafting and strategy of the Solomon proposal.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I just want to briefly correct a matter of fact. While the Clinton budget raises taxes on Social Security on the seniors, our budget does not. Furthermore, in the Medicare section it raises money by means testing premiums and by freezing reimbursements to physicians, not by freezing premiums at the higher rate that the Democrat budget does.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's remarks.

Mr. Chairman, let me address my comments this afternoon to my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle. It is no secret that many of them are uncomfortable having to vote for \$336 billion in new taxes later on tonight.

My plea to them is before they do that, understand that by voting for the Solomon budget they can cut spending first. This plan has \$265 billion more in spending cuts, more than the President's bill, a 4 to 1 ratio of spending cuts to revenue increases, and it makes the tough decisions on the pork-barrel projects that are in the other documents on both sides of the aisle.

□ 1700

Second, before voting for \$336 billion in new taxes, understand if you are going to do that, taxes ought to go to deficit reduction, not new spending. This is the plan that cuts the deficit by \$637 billion over the life of the budget cycle, \$171 billion more than Mr. Clinton.

Third, before dealing with just new taxes, understand this is your only chance to vote against the taxes on the middle-income people of our particular proposal. It is this, the Solomon budget, that eliminates the Btu tax, that eliminates the inheritance tax, that eliminates the Social Security tax.

Before voting for new taxes and new spending, know that this is the alternative where you can make sure that that tax increase goes to fund incentives for economic growth, such as cap-

ital gains, such as passive loss, such as the tax extenders. Before you vote for \$336 billion in new revenue and \$178 billion in new spending, know that this is the one plan that is fair.

As Ross Perot would say if he were standing here, he would say if deficit reduction is our goal, and bipartisan-ship is our mode of operation, it is the Solomon budget that each and every one of us ought to be voting for. Why? Because it takes the best of both to reduce the deficit.

Imagine we are going through all of this \$336 billion in new taxes and we are still going to end up with about \$200 billion a year in annual deficits. The American people do not find that acceptable, Mr. Chairman. This is the alternative for you to go home, and before you give the President your due party loyalty later tonight, make sure you can go home and say I voted for tax fairness, I voted to cut spending first, and I voted to use new revenue for deficit reduction.

Vote for the Solomon budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Solomon budget substitute.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, the American people sent us a very loud and a very clear message. They told us that they wanted us to work together to get our house in order and to put the American economy back on track. They told us that they wanted the deficits that are threatening their children's futures brought under control, that they wanted a fairer and more equitable tax system, and that they wanted us to put policies in place to get the economy moving.

Mr. Chairman, if the Members of this body were really listening to the American people last year, and if they were really listening to them now, they would be voting for the Solomon substitute. We have put together a budget alternative which is closer to what the American people have told us they want than any other budget resolution which has been offered.

Our budget delivers a third more in deficit reduction over 5 years than the Democrat plan with less than half the new taxes. For every \$1 in new taxes that our proposal raises, we cut spending by \$4. The Democrat proposal doesn't even cut spending by \$1 for every new dollar in taxes—a far cry from what the President promised.

Our spending restraints and cuts, moreover, are specified, not promised. The American people have told us that they are frustrated and angry with the budget shenanigans that they see us engage in year after year. This is an honest budget.

Our plan calls for reductions in spending before, not after, we start collecting new taxes. We aren't asking tax payers to buy any more pigs in the poke.

Finally, our budget gives the American people the kind of economic program they want without asking an already overtaxed middle-class to send even more of its income to Washington.

Republican Members of the House have worked together over the past several days to put together a budget resolution for fiscal year

1994 which we believe truly reflects the priorities and the desire for change among the American people. We believe that it is a budget which both Republicans and Democrats can support.

In assembling the Solomon substitute, Mr. Chairman, we identified three objectives: substantial deficit reduction by means of real restraint and actual cuts in Federal Government spending; a fair and realistic package of proposals to increase Federal revenues by asking the wealthiest Americans—and only the wealthiest Americans—to pay more in taxes, and; an overall budget plan that would not threaten or undermine the prospects for a continuing economic recovery. I believe that we achieved each of those objectives and that they are reflected in our budget resolution.

First, let's look at deficit reduction and how we achieved it. The Solomon substitute achieves substantially more deficit reduction next year and over the next 5 years than either of the budget plans that came out of the House Budget Committee. Our budget reduces the deficit of \$620 billion over 5 years. That's about \$160 billion more in deficit reduction than the Democrat budget achieves despite the fact that it calls for over a quarter of a billion dollars in net new taxes over the next 5 years.

Our budget achieves deficit reduction primarily by controlling the rate of spending growth in most Federal program spending, and by making actual cuts in other non-essential Federal programs. Those of us who assembled this substitute share with all of our Republican colleagues the view that America suffers under the weight of this monstrous deficit not because the vast majority of her people are taxed too little, but because the Federal Government spends too much—much too much. Our budget reflects that belief.

Because the Solomon substitute takes the Republican budget committee proposal as its base, it adopts what is in effect a baseline freeze on all nondefense Federal discretionary spending. What this means, in terms that normal people can understand, is that spending for more than 90 percent of all Federal discretionary programs will grow over the next 5 years by an amount equal to the inflation rate over the next 5 years. Critical programs like Pell grants and Head Start will not see their funding cut.

Our proposal does, however, call for and specify actual reductions in funding for other programs. For example, we eliminate funding for the superconducting super collider, cut funding for special interest Federal highway projects, cut agricultural subsidies to individuals with nonfarm incomes of over \$100,000, and cut funding for support of the already oversized but still growing Government bureaucracies. As a result of our determination to hold the line on spending, spending cuts account for more than 80 percent of the deficit reduction in the Solomon substitute. Unspecified spending reduction accounts for barely half of the deficit reduction in the Democrat package.

Mr. Chairman, I think that JOHN KASICH and my Republican colleagues on the Budget Committee did a remarkable, and a remarkably honest job in their budget on the savings side. They showed that we can make a sub-

stantial dent in the deficit without resorting to unspecified promises of spending restraint and without resorting to the massive tax increases that the administration and the majority leadership are calling for. All of my Republican colleagues involved in drafting this alternative budget share that view.

The American people, however, have made clear that they expect us to produce a budget package that makes more dramatic reductions in the Federal deficit that can be achieved by spending cuts alone. It is for this reason that many of my colleagues and I believe that we need to go significantly further than our Republican colleagues on the Budget Committee. And the only way to do that is by asking the wealthiest Americans to make a contribution in higher taxes. Our alternative budget does that. We raise nearly \$140 billion in new taxes over 5 years by incorporating already proposed tax increases on the wealthy, while at the same time stripping all of those new taxes proposed by President Clinton and the Democrats—such as the Btu tax and higher taxes on Social Security recipients—which hit lower and middle-income Americans hard. Contrary to the rhetoric, these taxes will hit middle-income American families and retired Americans hard.

President Clinton made a promise to shield middle-income Americans from the impact of new taxes. The President and his party are breaking that promise. We have a budget which gives them the opportunity to keep it.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, the new taxes that we include in our proposal do not get implemented until after the spending restraint and the spending cuts we have proposed begin to be implemented. We are not asking any American to again pay for promises which they know have been made and broken many times before. We do indeed cut spending first.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we sought to bring a budget resolution to the floor which would be pro-growth.

The economy is finally showing signs of life, though no one can take comfort from the extent of the recovery thus far. Job growth statistics, in particular, remain disappointing. Nonetheless, the economy is showing increased strength and the last thing we want to do is sap that strength. We want to support the recovery and keep as many Americans as possible on the job. The Solomon substitute contains a substantial package of tax incentives for business investment which will contribute to productivity growth and the creation of new jobs.

Moreover, though our proposal calls for very substantial reductions in defense spending, it takes into consideration the fact that defense dollars provide more than just guns and jet fighters. Defense dollars provide jobs—millions of jobs for American workers. We have just had a very bitter reminder, Mr. Chairman, of the human pain which defense downsizing entails. And no doubt, there will be more of it. The question, however, is how much more and how fast. Our budget calls for non-administratively related cuts of \$60 billion in defense over 5 years. This is in addition—and it is very important to point this out because many of my Democrat colleagues conveniently fail to do so—to almost \$75 billion in cuts that President Bush proposed before leaving office

earlier this year. The Democrat budget calls for cuts that are twice as large, will be twice as painful, and will cost twice as many Americans—military and nonmilitary—their jobs.

Mr. Chairman, the Solomon substitute, based on what I've heard from the people in my district and in the places I've traveled across America, is the kind of budget the American people want, and I would urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McHALE].

Mr. McHALE. Mr. Chairman, there is a sense of historic expectation in the House today for we are engaged in a hard-fought battle on issues of real importance. There is an appropriate awareness that the vote on the budget resolution and investment package will reflect a fundamental redefinition of our national goals, a conscious shift from consumption to investment, and a renewed commitment to the traditional ideals of American democracy. In short, Mr. Chairman, if enacted, the Solomon amendment will kill President Clinton's effort to rebuild America.

During the next few hours Members of Congress will rise to present competing visions for our Nation's future. Prompted by timidity and excessive partisanship, some will urge that we reject the President's proposals. By contrast, I believe that 12 years of drift, debt, and decline—12 years of voodoo economics—is long enough. With President Clinton, I believe we must boldly affirm last November's electoral mandate by passing the budget and stimulus package now before the House.

First and foremost, I believe that America's future must be built upon a cornerstone of economic prosperity. It was Hubert Humphrey who once said the best social program is a job. In keeping with that philosophy the Clinton budget will create jobs in both the public and private sectors, rebuild highway and mass transit systems, spur technological research and development, assist urban revitalization through community development block grants and enterprise zones, increase support for small business development, and fully fund the Pell Grant Program so that students from middle-income families can afford to go to college.

Second, I believe that America's future must be defined by the parameters of fiscal responsibility. During the past 12 years we have accrued a \$4.1 trillion debt—an unwarranted burden of over \$15,000 for each man, woman, and child in America. Mr. Chairman, I want to leave my children something more than a mortgage. The Clinton budget, as amended in committee, reduces the deficit by \$510 billion over the next 5 years. The President has proposed 150 specific spending cuts totaling \$247 bil-

lion—and thereafter, the Budget Committee has cut an additional \$63 billion in proposed spending.

As a Democrat who plans to vote for the balanced budget amendment and for the line-item veto, I commend the President's leadership in crafting a budget which reflects a sense of fiscal restraint so lacking during the excessive spending of the 1980's.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I believe that America's future must be shaped by the traditional ideals of social justice. Taxes must be fair. Burdens should be shared. And opportunity must not be limited to the wealthy few. The Clinton budget will provide full funding for Head Start, WIC childhood immunizations, and the Ryan White AIDS Program. It rejects the special interest tax policies of the last two Presidential administrations.

At the heart of the Clinton budget can be found three basic goals: A realistic stimulus for job creation; a genuine commitment to deficit reduction; and a renewed belief in equality and social justice under law. These are the same reasons I ran for Congress—and these are the reasons I urge my colleagues to reject the Solomon amendment and to support the President's economic plan. The election is over. Rhetoric should be cooled. It is time to govern.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] who is a former member of the Committee on the Budget and now serves admirably on the Committee on Ways and Means and has been indeed an architect of this plan.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, straight talk. Get real. That was Ross Perot's message to Americans and her Government leaders. That was his only message. And the great gift that he gave the people of America was an understanding of the enormity of the deficit and the dark cloud it hangs over our economy and our ability to create the very jobs that our kids' futures depend upon. He gave us that gift, and that is the measure of what we do here on the floor.

I thank my colleague from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] for recognizing the intellectual honesty of the Solomon proposal that I am a part of proposing to you today. Yes, it is very tough. It cuts spending more rigorously than any other proposal you will have a chance to vote on today.

It also raises taxes. I cannot tell you how many people have come to me on the street saying I am willing to pay more, but I want that coupled with an honest, tough budget that cuts spending. Well, this budget does that. It raises taxes on those most able to pay, and couples those tax increases with two things: the extenders to stimulate

the economy, to assure continued production of low-income housing, of research and development, of education and so on, and with the toughest budget cuts anyone has proposed. And in the end the benefit is that we reduce the deficit in a way that will assure growth in America's future.

In contrast, the budget that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are proposing will leave us in 5 years precisely where we are, with a deficit the same size as we face now, but with spending far higher.

Ask yourselves: Are new taxes, new spending worth being in the same place in 5 years when that place is destroying the job-creating power of America's small-business sector? Look at the testimony we are hearing on the tax provisions in the Democrats' proposal. Over and over again, we are told the new tax burdens far outweigh the investment incentives to create jobs. Small business in Connecticut will be paralyzed by this proposal. Many are barely surviving now and they will pay higher Btu taxes, higher business taxes, higher Medicare taxes, and assume new and heavy paperwork burdens. The small business sector is the job creator in our society. It is the only sector creating jobs, so will strangling it create growth?

I ask my colleagues, for the people, vote for the Solomon amendment. It doesn't kill our job producers with taxes but couples taxes on our truly wealthy with real, serious spending cuts to reduce the deficit far more effectively than any other proposal you'll have the chance to vote on. To turn the economy around, vote "yes."

Mr. SABO. Before yielding further, I would indicate to the gentlewoman from Connecticut that the majority budget resolution substantially reduces the deficit in 1996, 1997, and 1998.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for giving me the time and for his leadership in bringing this very fine budget resolution to the floor today. I rise in strong support of the resolution and very reluctantly in opposition to the Solomon substitute. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] knows the esteem in which I hold him, but I do not support his budget resolution. I know that comes as no surprise to him.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased today and happy because for the first time in a long time, for many of us it is the first time we will have a chance to support a President's budget, a budget which reflects the values of our constituents. I believe that a budget should be a statement of our values. We spend money on what is important to us. We do that in our personal lives, and we should do that as a country.

At long last we have a budget that does this by recognizing that the

strength of our country can be defined in the health and well-being of our people as well as our ability to defend ourselves and to keep the peace.

□ 1730

At long last we have a statement of values in our budget which puts people first by investing in people with increased funding for Head Start, WIC, child immunization, and full funding of the Ryan White AIDS Program. That is very critical to my district, and I thank the chairman for the generosity in the budget on that score.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal about our various deficits. We have had the budget deficit, the trade deficit, the family income deficit, and the list of deficits goes on, and included among those is the social deficit of the last 12 years, a time where social initiatives were starved in order for us to build up other sections of the budget. At long last, this inequity will be redressed, and we will be doing it in a fiscally sound way, fiscally responsible way, as this budget resolution does call for a cut, a reduction, of \$510 billion in our own budget deficit over the next 5 years.

In fact, the President asked for cuts, and this Committee on the Budget cut the budget further by \$63 billion from the original proposal that they had received.

It is a budget that is a statement of our values, because it creates jobs and gives every person a real opportunity. It assumes increased funding for jobs programs and job training, innovative education and lifelong-learning programs, mass transit, highway construction, research and development, defense conversion, and a variety of other investment programs. It also restores tax fairness to our system by placing the heaviest burden on the most affluent in our society.

This is not about class warfare. It is about redressing the problem of the past 10 or 12 years where the wealthiest in our country enjoyed the benefits of the lightest tax burden. It also contains funds for expansion of the earned income tax credit which rewards low-income people for working. As our President has said over and over again in his remarks, people who work in our country will no longer have an inability to feed their families or to take care of their families, because they will now have the earned income tax credit.

Mr. Chairman, when I was young I remember my parents always saying when there was bad news, whether it was illness or death in the family, "How are we going to tell the children?" I think if we do not support this budget resolution and the stimulus package that goes with it, we will have a difficult time telling the children why, why it was not important to invest in them, why people could understand that investment in infrastruc-

ture, of highways, was a stimulus, and a good investment for our country, but investing in our children's education, in Head Start, giving them all a head start was not considered a good investment.

For these reasons, for the children, for our values, for the strength of our country being defined differently, as I said earlier, and the strength in the health and well-being of our country, I urge my colleagues to support this budget resolution, to defeat the Solomon resolution, and then, in conclusion, to support the stimulus package later this evening.

Give the President a chance. The American people want him to succeed. We should, too, in this House.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Solomon amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to President Clinton's economic package and I do so because I fear we are in danger of squandering a genuine window of opportunity to correct this Nation's fiscal course and halt its competitive slide in the worldwide economy.

The prevailing sentiment from those residents of northern New Jersey who have expressed their support for the Clinton economic proposal—and they are significantly outnumbered by those who oppose it—is that this plan is better than nothing.

I would agree. This plan is better than the status quo. But it is not good enough. And if we fail to act decisively now, we may not get another opportunity like this for years. And by then, it may be too late. Too late to regain our position in the global economy.

Clearly, the budget deficit and our declining position in the global economy require firm action and determined leadership, now. The accumulating national debt pose a real and growing danger to our economic well-being.

The billions of dollars we spend on interest on that national debt is money that is not available to create one job, repair one bridge, pay one medical bill, provide one student loan or train one young American. In addition, those interest payments are slowly strangling economic growth.

Because I view this crisis so seriously, I have always refused to rule out enactment of carefully structured, new taxes designated for deficit reduction. More of this later when I discuss the Solomon amendment.

However, and this is where the Clinton program fails to meet the commonsense test: Before we ask the people of New Jersey and the rest of the Nation to shoulder higher taxes, we must demand significant and enforceable spending cuts. Moreover, we simply can not afford to create new and expanded spending programs.

Yes, there are a number of program cuts in the Clinton package but I am alarmed that it also includes over \$180 billion in new spending. Even more alarming is that the President has proposed new programs that—once started—will take on a life of their own and be-

come the budgetary equivalents of new entitlement programs. I speak specifically of the national service program which could open up a budgetary Pandora's box.

No, our approach must be pay as you go—and new spending must be offset by corresponding reductions in other areas. No more of the buy-now-pay-later system that has ruled this city for decades.

And, all spending cuts and deficit reduction goals must be strictly enforceable, with real incentives and penalties to force future Congresses to abide by the framework we establish this year. These enforcement mechanisms are one of the primary reasons the Solomon Amendment gained my support.

Without procedural and system budget reform, any progress we make this year will be in real jeopardy.

Let me remind my colleagues of the path my State of New Jersey has followed. Just 3 short years ago, Gov. James Florio threw money at the schools but without a system of fundamental reforms. We cannot allow President Clinton and this Congress to follow that same failed path.

I am mindful of the President's challenge to those who would oppose his plan to come up with one of their own.

Frankly, the approach that most closely mirrors my approach is that proposed by Mr. SOLOMON of New York and several of my Republican colleagues.

The Solomon plan would bring about a nearly \$500 billion reduction in the deficit over 5 years. That is far better than the Clinton's deficit reduction of just \$325 billion. The Solomon plan contains no new spending—cuts the Clinton tax increases in half while protecting the middle class and those on Social Security—has a 4-to-1 ratio of spending reductions to tax increases and dedicates all of the higher taxes of deficit reduction. I would add that all of the spending cuts occur before any tax increase takes effect. Most important—the Solomon approach contains mandatory sequestration if, or when, Congress exceeds its budget limits. This is a blueprint, if you will for a sound deficit reduction package. But there is room for improvement and need to modify, for example: It falls into the same old trap of attempting to balance the budget on the backs of those in our society—the frail elderly. It attacks Medicare and Medicaid to the amount of \$85 billion. Now, we should not institute a system of means testing without open and complete debate and analysis. This magnitude of cuts I cannot accept because it will greatly tax our frail elderly.

Second, the Solomon plan does not go far enough with some of its spending cuts. Yes, we should eliminate the super collider, but we also should zero out the space station, the advanced solid rocket motor program, the *Seawolf* submarine, end the below market use of Federal lands, significantly curtail the range of agricultural subsidies and the list goes on and on.

What this country also needs is a strong save and invest in America program of tax incentives—targeted capitals gain tax reduction, investment tax credit, expanded IRA's for first-time homebuyers and medical expenses, mortgage revenue bonds, and so forth—that will encourage U.S. business and individuals

alike to invest in new plants and equipment to become more competitive in the ongoing global economic wars. We owe it to the American people to take these important steps before we ask them to shoulder additional tax burdens. Indeed, Republicans in the other body are proposing strengthening the package with investment incentives.

Nevertheless, I support the Solomon amendment because it most nearly focuses on the mark for spending cuts and takes the intellectually honest approach of acknowledging the need for marginal tax rate increases and the millionaire's surtax while protecting the middle class.

This is a blueprint that starts us on credible deficit reduction.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], a member of the Committee on the Budget and a former member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I think the real issue here is which proposal is going to make the genuine cuts that would justify any tax increases.

We already learned through the Kasich plan that you can arrive at a \$200 billion deficit in 1998 through spending cuts and not raising taxes, but if you want to get below the \$200 billion, then, yes, it would require some tax increases. The Kasich plan established the bottomline in beginning the deficit-reduction effort.

The Solomon plan builds on that strength by accepting some moderate tax increases.

The American people have said to us, "We are willing to risk some new taxes provided we meet two prerequisites, that we cut spending first, and we make a dramatic dent in the Federal budget deficit." And the Solomon plan accomplishes both.

We have heard here today that the budget resolution that has been passed out of the Committee on the Budget will cut spending, but, ladies and gentlemen, it cuts spending in the out years, in 1997 and 1998. The average life of a budget agreement in this Congress over the last decade has been 2, perhaps 3 years.

I think it is telling to look at the charts, and when you see what the Clinton plan will accomplish in spending cuts in 1994 and 1995. It accomplishes about 6 to 8 percent of the spending cuts in the first 2 years out of the 5 years, and hope that these other spending cuts will never occur.

The difference is in this plan that the spending cuts are up front, because the American people should not have to pay for tax increases if they are not going to get the spending cuts, not to mention the fact that the resolution of the Committee on the Budget tremendously taxes people.

Should my constituents pay for an energy tax on home heating oil when we are not making a genuine effort to cut spending?

As you can see here, there is a big difference, ladies and gentlemen, in the terms of tax increases versus spending cuts. The tax increases under the House budget resolution are \$336 billion compared to the Solomon plan of \$112 billion. The big difference is on the spending cuts, a full \$685 billion of the Solomon plan, and only \$219 billion with the budget resolution. There is a big difference, ladies and gentlemen, if you want spending to be cut.

The more we increase taxes, the more we spend. Therefore, we have front-loaded the spending cuts in order to demonstrate to the American people that we, in fact, are going to cut spending, that we are not going to use the tax increases to increase Government spending.

Furthermore, the Solomon plan increases the taxes on those people who can best afford it, on those who are earning more than \$200,000. That is exactly what President Clinton promised the American people during the course of the campaign. He did not promise to raise taxes on people who were earning \$20,000, \$30,000, my constituents who earn \$14,000, but that is what we have in the House budget resolution. You are taxing the low-to-middle income.

We take that out, and we tax the wealthy.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SNOWE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is so right, and I would say to my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], who is the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, and we have great respect for him, he pointed out that, yes, the Democrat budget does have significant cuts in the last 3 years, but the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] has pointed out that sequestration, in other words, the 1990 Budget Control Act, expires at the end of 1995, and if you look at that chart, as you have pointed out, the Democrat budget cuts only \$6 billion in 1994, \$10 billion in 1995, and then heavy cuts after the triggering mechanism for sequestration is dead and gone.

In our budget there is a chart underneath there which shows that we have legislation written into our budget which establishes a Gramm-Rudman procedure triggering mandatory sequestration cuts across-the-board if actions by this Congress fail to meet these budget-discipline caps. That means we continue the sequestration and across-the-board cuts for all 5 years.

That is why you ought to be voting for this if you really want to do something for the American people.

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the gentleman for his effort. I also should say that we

also accomplish another one of the President's campaign goals and promises, and that was to reduce the deficit by 50 percent over 4 years. This budget does that in 4 years, as well as 5.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me assure the gentleman from New York that our expectations are that the discretionary spending caps will be continued beyond 1995, through 1998.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I spoke before about Reaganomics, the Reaganomics of the Reagan and Bush years. I spoke before about how chickens are coming home to roost, that we are now suffering because of the fallacy of Reaganomics, that you could somehow increase spending, cut taxes, and the day of reckoning will never come, but the day of reckoning is here.

□ 1740

We know that the Reagan-Bush policies have given us high budget deficits. What they have also given us, unfortunately, is high recession and high unemployment, and I rise today in opposition to the Solomon amendment and in strong support of the House Concurrent Resolution 64, which is the budget resolution and President Clinton's economic stimulus package.

I support the entire package and especially the stimulus package because I believe it will help many Americans rise out of the recession that has plagued our economy. Some people look at recent economic figures and claim we do not need to act. But I remind those agents of the status quo that jobs are being cut, not created, in the downsized economy. That leaves many people out of work, many teenagers out on the streets and many families wondering how they will make ends meet.

In our deliberations it is easy to get lost in the numbers game while forgetting the impact our decisions have on the lives of the people we serve.

We talk about billions of dollars and thousands of jobs, but rarely do we focus on the value of a good education or a steady job.

This stimulus package will create 675,000 additional summer jobs for our youth. It will provide extended unemployment benefits to people who want to work but cannot find a job. In my region of the country, the New York City area, 10 percent of the people are unemployed.

It will invest in infrastructure and education so that we can offer the displaced workers and their children a brighter future.

Because we are required to account for the money we appropriate, a dollar

figure is attached to these programs and we debate their merits. That is responsible Government. But, I ask, how do you measure the value of hope?

The Childhood Immunization Program in the stimulus package will cost \$300 million, but its value in future health care cost savings and the added ability to educate a healthy child cannot be measured. The \$753 million we plan to invest in mass transit will create jobs and improve our ability to move people in and out of our cities. Can we really tell how much that means to the economic viability of our urban areas or the quality of the environment? When we appropriate \$32 million to fund service jobs for older Americans, can we put a price on the knowledge they pass on to our youth?

To be bold or not to be bold—that is really the question we are debating here today. If we fail to act, we will crush the hopes and expectations of the American people.

Some people will argue that this package goes too far, and others will say it does not go far enough. No one will ever be completely satisfied. The fact is that this stimulus package is well-measured and economically sound. It will create badly needed jobs and invest in the future of our people and our economy.

And perhaps most importantly, it nurtures hope—a commodity that is difficult to measure but definitely needed for us to succeed.

I urge my colleagues to support the stimulus package.

We have not had an urban program or a program for our cities in the past 12 years. It is nice to have a President who cares about our cities.

Last year millions of Americans went to the polls and elected our new President.

The American people voted for change. I support this President. I support his plan, and I support the Budget Committee's resolution.

I have found in my district and indeed across the country the American people support this plan. They will support this plan because they believe that the pain is spread fairly. The pain is spread fairly. The American people want to invest in the future. This is a sound plan. The President is right, and I urge my colleagues to reject all the amendments and support the Budget Committee's plan.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCCRERY], a former member of the Budget Committee and now a member of the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means, on the Republican side.

Mr. MCCRERY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, my support of the Solomon substitute reflects my belief that the deficit and the accumulated national debt constitute the most serious

problem facing our Nation. My support is also a reflection of my belief that a short-term approach to dealing with the deficit should contain both spending cuts and revenue increases, but with a heavy emphasis on spending cuts. The Solomon substitute is a serious attempt to deal effectively with the deficit for the short term.

I say "short term" because, as has been eloquently explained by my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], no long term solution to our deficit problem is complete without reforms to bring down the rate of increase in health care costs.

Before I go further, I want to express my sincere appreciation to the President, the Democrats on the Budget Committee, and to my Republican colleagues on the Budget Committee for their willingness to make tough choices designed to bring down the level of deficit spending by the Federal Government.

Whether the choices are tax increases or spending cuts, they are difficult for a politician to make, and those who have honestly faced those choices and taken a stand are to be commended.

I think the President's plan, though, even as modified by the Budget Committee Democrats, is the wrong prescription to cure our ailing fisc.

The Democrats' plan relies far too much on tax increases, and far too little on spending cuts, to reach a deficit figure in 1998 that is still more than half the size it would be if we did nothing at all.

In fact, the Democrats' plan only cuts spending \$6 billion in 1994, \$10.8 billion in 1995, including debt service savings, and even if all the spending cuts scheduled for the last 3 years in their plan actually take place, and that is a big if, still, fully 55 percent of the total deficit reduction over 5 years comes from increased taxes.

Now, compare the numbers in the Solomon substitute. In the first year of the plan, spending would be cut \$41.7 billion, while taxes would be increased by only \$10.3 billion, and, over the 5 years of the plan, only 19 percent of the deficit reduction is due to tax increases, while 81 percent is due to spending reductions. In the Solomon plan, you get over \$4 of spending cuts for every \$1 of tax increases, while in the Democrats' plan, you get only 80 cents of spending cuts for every \$1 of tax increases.

Mr. Chairman, as courageous as each of these choices is, there is a clear philosophical difference between the Solomon plan and the Democrats' plan. Both make an honest attempt to reduce the deficit. But one, the Democrat plan, taxes people first, in a big way — (the Democrats' tax increase is retroactive to January 1, 1993) then only later cuts spending, and that's only promised. The other, the Solomon plan,

cuts spending deeply, in the very first year, and continues to rely primarily on spending cuts to achieve \$155 billion more in deficit reduction than the Democrats' plan.

Our plan would keep the promises made by the President during the campaign:

It cuts the deficit in half in 4 years, the Clinton/Democrat budget does not. It does not raise taxes on the middle class; the Clinton/Democrat budget does.

It raises taxes only on those making \$200,000/year or more; the Clinton/Democrat plan raises taxes on families making as little as \$20,000/year.

Yes, the choice is clear between the Solomon plan and the Democrats' plan. If you want the largest tax increase in the history of the United States; if you want a budget that taxes first, cuts spending later; if you want a budget that doesn't even cut the deficit in half over the next 4 years, then vote for the Democrat budget.

But if you want a budget that cuts spending first; if you want a budget that cuts the deficit in half in 4 years; if you want a budget that seriously cuts Government waste and spending, then the Solomon substitute is the clear choice.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], a distinguished member of our budget working group.

□ 1750

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I would just like to remind the American people and those who are going to vote today that we have almost a \$300 billion payment for the interest on the national debt right now. None of that money goes for infrastructure. None of that money goes for investment. That money does not go back to the American people.

There are three points I want to make. Our main mission here with this budget is to reduce the debt. Three points.

First, the Solomon package reduces the deficit more than any other package before us today, that is \$637 billion in 5 years.

Second, the economic stimulus part of this package, and it is part of this package, is conducive without a doubt, and you would all agree on this, with economic productivity in the private sector, plus something that we seriously need to consider, and please listen to this if you are watching on your monitors in the office, it creates the infrastructure necessary for those programs that we need for children, for education, for the poor, et cetera. It creates those necessary programs, the infrastructure necessary for that, so that they are available.

Third, fair tax structure for the middle class and senior citizens.

Vote for the Solomon amendment.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY], a distinguished member of our committee.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 64 and in opposition to the Solomon amendment.

Although I am the Budget Committee's newest member, I am proud to have played an important role in crafting a Budget Resolution which fundamentally reorders our Nation's priorities.

The American public called on us to shift spending away from defense to programs that address the real concerns of Americans, jobs, health care, education, defense conversion and deficit reduction.

Our budget recognizes the concerns of Americans which have been ignored far too long, while the Solomon amendment continues to neglect them. That is the essential difference between our proposals.

Now is the time to correct these inequities. That is exactly what I came to Washington to do.

I declare today with confidence and pride that the budget resolution reflects our Nation's common agenda.

The budget resolution recognizes that we can invest in our Nation's future by using defense savings to jumpstart the economy, promote long-term economic growth and invest in the people of America.

I am pleased to say that our budget plan will reduce the deficit by \$510 billion over the next 5 years. With spending increases being offset by substantial decreases in the defense budget, overall discretionary spending will not increase over the next 5 years under this budget agreement.

Some of my colleagues say that we did not cut enough. Others say that we cut too much. There is no doubt, however, that we crafted a budget that successfully reorders our national priorities in the context of reducing our budget deficit.

Frankly, we were faced with tough choices and we made difficult but responsible decisions.

The budget proposal is balanced, fair, economically responsible and it strikes a common middle ground that will work for all Americans.

We finally have an administration that understands the importance of investing in our infrastructure and in our Nation's most valuable resource, our people.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to defeat the Solomon amendment and support the budget resolution.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the 1 minute remaining.

Mr. Chairman, as we listened to all the debate today, I know that the easy vote on all these Budget Resolutions is no, but we came here to make tough choices. We came here to lead, to govern, and in fact we should say no to business as usual.

For all the folks in this country who want real deficit reduction, this is the best plan, and I would urge a yes vote.

This is fairness. This is cutting spending first and that is what the people want. We can give it to them with a vote in favor of the Solomon consensus budget.

I would ask all my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 20, noes 409, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

AYES—20

Boehlert	Johnson (CT)	Shays
Fish	Levy	Snowe
Gilchrist	McCrery	Solomon
Gilman	McHugh	Upton
Gunderson	Orton	Walsh
Hoekstra	Regula	Young (FL)
Houghton	Roukema	

NOES—409

Abercrombie	Brown (FL)	DeFazio
Ackerman	Brown (OH)	DeLauro
Allard	Bryant	DeLay
Andrews (ME)	Bunning	Dellums
Andrews (NJ)	Burton	Derrick
Andrews (TX)	Buyer	Deutsch
Applegate	Byrne	Diaz-Balart
Archer	Callahan	Dickey
Army	Calvert	Dicks
Bacchus (FL)	Camp	Dingell
Bacchus (AL)	Canady	Dixon
Baer	Cantwell	Dooley
Baker (CA)	Cardin	Doolittle
Baker (LA)	Carr	Dornan
Ballenger	Castle	Dreier
Barcia	Chapman	Duncan
Barlow	Clay	Dunn
Barrett (NE)	Clayton	Durbin
Barrett (WI)	Clement	Edwards (CA)
Bartlett	Clinger	Edwards (TX)
Barton	Clyburn	Emerson
Bateman	Coble	Engel
Becerra	Coleman	English (AZ)
Beilenson	Collins (GA)	English (OK)
Bentley	Collins (IL)	Eshoo
Bereuter	Collins (MI)	Evans
Berman	Combest	Everett
Bevill	Condit	Ewing
Bilbray	Conyers	Fawell
Bilirakis	Cooper	Fazio
Bishop	Coppersmith	Fields (LA)
Blackwell	Costello	Fields (TX)
Bliley	Cox	Flner
Blute	Coyne	Fingerhut
Boehner	Cramer	Flake
Bonilla	Crane	Foglietta
Bonior	Crapo	Ford (MI)
Borski	Cunningham	Fowler
Boucher	Danner	Frank (MA)
Brewster	Darden	Frank (CT)
Brooks	de la Garza	Franks (NJ)
Browder	de Lugo (VI)	Frost
Brown (CA)	Deal	Furse

Galleghy	Lloyd	Rostenkowski
Gallo	Long	Roth
Gejdenson	Lowey	Rowland
Gekas	Machtley	Roybal-Allard
Gephardt	Maloney	Royce
Geren	Mann	Rush
Gibbons	Manton	Sabo
Gillmor	Manzullo	Sanders
Gingrich	Margolies-	Sangmeister
Glickman	Mezvinsky	Santorom
Gonzalez	Markey	Sarpalius
Goodlatte	Martinez	Sawyer
Goodling	Matsui	Saxton
Gordon	Mazzoli	Schaefer
Goss	McCandless	Schenk
Grams	McCloskey	Schiff
Grandy	McCollum	Schroeder
Green	McCurdy	Schumer
Greenwood	McDade	Scott
Gutierrez	McDermott	Sensenbrenner
Hall (OH)	McHale	Serrano
Hall (TX)	McInnis	Sharp
Hamburg	McKeon	Shaw
Hamilton	McKinney	Shepherd
Hancock	McMillan	Shuster
Hansen	McNulty	Siskis
Harman	Meehan	Skaggs
Hastert	Meek	Skeen
Hastings	Menendez	Skelton
Hayes	Meyers	Slaterry
Hefley	Mfume	Slaughter
Hefner	Mica	Smith (IA)
Herger	Michel	Smith (MI)
Hillard	Miller (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Hinchey	Miller (FL)	Smith (OR)
Hoagland	Mineta	Smith (TX)
Hobson	Minge	Spence
Hochbrueckner	Mink	Spratt
Hoke	Moakley	Stark
Holden	Molinari	Stearns
Horn	Mollohan	Stenholm
Hoyer	Montgomery	Stokes
Huffington	Moorhead	Strickland
Hughes	Moran	Studds
Hunter	Morella	Stump
Hutchinson	Murphy	Stupak
Hutto	Murtha	Sundquist
Hyde	Nadler	Sweet
Inglis	Natcher	Swift
Inhofe	Neal (MA)	Synar
Inslee	Neal (NC)	Talent
Istook	Norton (DC)	Tanner
Jacobs	Nussle	Tauzin
Jefferson	Oberstar	Taylor (MS)
Johnson (GA)	Obey	Taylor (NC)
Johnson (SD)	Oliver	Tejeda
Johnson, E.B.	Ortiz	Thomas (CA)
Johnson, Sam	Owens	Thomas (WY)
Johnston	Oxley	Thornton
Kanjorski	Packard	Thurman
Kaptur	Pallone	Torkildsen
Kasich	Parker	Torres
Kennedy	Pastor	Torricelli
Kennelly	Paxon	Towns
Kildee	Payne (NJ)	Trafficant
Kim	Payne (VA)	Tucker
King	Pelosi	Underwood (GU)
Kingston	Penny	Unsoeld
Kleczka	Peterson (FL)	Valentine
Klein	Peterson (MN)	Velazquez
Klink	Petri	Vento
Klug	Pickett	Visclosky
Knollenberg	Pickle	Volkmer
Kolbe	Pombo	Vucanovich
Kopetski	Pomeroy	Walker
Kreidler	Porter	Washington
Kyl	Poshard	Waters
LaFalce	Price (NC)	Watt
Lambert	Pryce (OH)	Waxman
Lancaster	Quinn	Weldon
Lantos	Rahall	Wheat
LaRocco	Ramstad	Whitten
Laughlin	Rangel	Williams
Lazio	Ravenel	Wilson
Leach	Reed	Wise
Lehman	Reynolds	Wolf
Levin	Richardson	Woolsey
Lewis (CA)	Ridge	Wyden
Lewis (FL)	Roberts	Wynn
Lewis (GA)	Roemer	Yates
Lightfoot	Rogers	Young (AK)
Linder	Rohrabacher	Zeliff
Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen	Zimmer
Livingston	Rose	

NOT VOTING—6

Faleomavaega (AS)	Henry Myers	Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Ford (TN)	Quillen	

□ 1818

Messrs. PETE GEREN of Texas, FLAKE, TAYLOR of Mississippi, SMITH of Michigan, CRANE, LAZIO, KYL, and SWIFT changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 103-37.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MFUME

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. MFUME: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994.

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990).

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, and October 1, 1997:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$1,256,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,380,468,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,485,222,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,599,487,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,698,470,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$0.

Fiscal year 1995: \$0.

Fiscal year 1996: \$0.

Fiscal year 1997: \$0.

Fiscal year 1998: \$0.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$930,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995: \$104,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$111,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997: \$116,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$122,500,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$1,514,503,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,558,785,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,598,269,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,641,668,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,717,818,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$1,509,248,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,575,134,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,598,838,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,631,494,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,697,622,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: -\$252,948,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995: -\$194,666,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: -\$113,616,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997: -\$32,007,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: +\$848,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: \$4,715,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995: \$5,076,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$5,428,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997: \$5,776,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$6,141,400,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, and October 1, 1997, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$21,400,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$148,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$22,100,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$152,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$32,400,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$145,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$48,800,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$137,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$45,500,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$157,400,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1994 through 1998 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$251,644,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$272,646,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$217,809,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$251,334,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$187,464,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$217,525,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$162,060,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$91,582,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$167,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$175,583,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,644,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,796,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$14,900,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,894,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,212,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$15,300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,896,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,413,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$15,600,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,695,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,003,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,600,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$15,900,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,492,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,895,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$14,300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,494,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,988,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,456,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,924,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,787,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,218,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,459,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,872,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,758,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,163,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,311,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,187,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,110,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,817,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,027,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,751,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,975,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,710,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,948,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,689,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,605,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,850,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,891,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,161,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,901,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,161,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,875,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,134,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,654,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,911,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 1994:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,421,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,728,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$12,300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,321,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,677,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$11,700,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,159,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,568,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,800,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,145,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,599,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$11,300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,657,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,133,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$11,500,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 1994:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,443,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,507,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$84,700,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$85,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,652,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,969,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$87,500,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$88,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,541,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,567,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$89,100,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$91,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,321,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, — \$8,499,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$91,300,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$94,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, — \$6,557,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$93,300,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$97,000,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 1994:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,689,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,780,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,910,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,883,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,130,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,987,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,351,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,090,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,572,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,194,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 1994:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,535,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,352,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,000,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,500,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,263,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,085,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,500,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$3,400,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,563,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,472,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,600,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$3,500,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,657,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,472,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,600,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$3,500,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,736,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,549,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,700,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$3,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 1994:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,153,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,010,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$900,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$19,900,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,212,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,997,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,700,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$20,000,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,653,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,340,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,700,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$11,100,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,076,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,417,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$23,600,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,238,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,615,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$24,900,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 1994:
 (A) New budget authority, \$123,719,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$122,648,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, \$137,711,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$136,063,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, \$152,543,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$166,551,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$168,199,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$166,561,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$185,915,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$184,061,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 1994:

- (A) New budget authority, \$151,710,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$150,310,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, \$176,748,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$172,319,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, \$189,726,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$188,490,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$207,648,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$207,030,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$228,145,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$227,733,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 1994:

- (A) New budget authority, \$210,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$211,337,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, \$228,870,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$223,554,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, \$234,498,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$228,659,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$246,848,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$238,354,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$253,040,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$247,624,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 1994:

- (A) New budget authority, \$323,050,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$321,699,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, \$339,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$338,000,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, \$355,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$354,200,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$372,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$371,000,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$390,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$388,300,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 1994:

- (A) New budget authority, \$35,454,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$37,081,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,700,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$19,600,000,000.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, \$36,518,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$38,193,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,600,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$19,600,000,000.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, \$37,227,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$38,935,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,600,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$19,600,000,000.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$37,936,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$39,677,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$19,500,000,000.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$38,645,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$40,418,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,400,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$19,500,000,000.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 1994:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,336,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$16,285,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,456,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$16,405,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,521,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$16,469,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,925,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$16,872,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,987,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$16,934,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 1994:

- (A) New budget authority, \$13,279,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$13,468,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,125,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,521,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,257,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,998,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,312,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,023,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,512,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,057,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$208,713,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$208,713,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$223,740,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$223,740,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$236,376,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$236,376,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$246,186,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$246,186,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$258,020,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$258,020,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,137,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

□ 1820

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My thanks, as a preface to my remarks, to the distinguished gentleman who chairs the Committee on Rules as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking minority member on that committee for making in order this amendment that we present this afternoon on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus in coalition with the House progressive caucus.

Mr. Chairman, we have come here today out of a great sense of urgency and opportunity, a sense of opportunity because we believe we stand on the threshold of the dawning of a new partnership between the executive and legislative branches of our Government, a sense of urgency because the people whom we serve are desperately in need of compassion and immediate action to alleviate the conditions which so imperil and threaten their lives.

Since 1981, the Congressional Black Caucus has developed 10 alternative budgets. The impetus for those earlier budgets was a challenge, quite frankly, from then President Reagan who criticized those who criticized his call for increases in military spending, tax breaks to the wealthy, and the slashing of vital social service programs.

Mr. Chairman, the impetus for the budget that we now bring before our colleagues is to respond to the complete failure, as we see it, of previous business and budget priorities by previous administrations and to create also, as we see it, a new and dynamic approach to national fiscal policy which responds adequately to dramatically changed world conditions.

This budget grows out of the moral imperative that we, as members of the Congressional Black Caucus, and our colleagues in the House progressive caucus believe must be addressed. This alternative is motivated by the pain of those who suffer homelessness, illness without access to medical care, frustrated educational opportunities, the scourge of drug abuse, the violence that runs rampant in too many of our communities, the stagnation of our economy that has plunged millions into unemployment and then despair and then economic marginality.

And so we have worked diligently, Mr. Chairman, in an abbreviated time-frame to develop this document which seeks to find progressive solutions, to advance the cause of human dignity and social progress. We do not posture ourselves today here as an opposition coalition to the President's recommendations or, for that matter, the recommendations of the House Com-

mittee on the Budget. Rather, we have set out what we view as a set of aggressive alternative options for our Nation and our Nation's people.

Americans of all races and of all walks of life have suffered, especially during the economic decline that we are so much a part of. The resurgence in acts of racism and sexism and then class have forced themselves onto the front pages of our Nation's press. Our educational system still fails in many respects to prepare our children for their role as citizens and then workers. Our infrastructure is collapsing and small businesses desperately cry out for help. Millions are unserved or underserved by health care systems. And indeed, Mr. Chairman, we live in a world and in an era in which parents do not believe that their children will lead a better life than they once did.

These children of desperation find themselves having no recourse and lost ultimately into the plight and the misery of drugs and then death and then a world of violence. And so then we must find our salvation in responsible and honest budget proposals that challenge us as a nation and as a House to face the future with scourge and with skill and with compassion.

It is for those people and their parents and their grandparents and the hardworking and honest men and women of this Nation that we advance this alternative to give our view of how we make their world a safer and more supportive environment in which to live.

And in summary, our 1994 budget request allocates \$1.343 trillion in budget authority. It spends \$1.509 trillion in outlays. It raises \$1.256 trillion in revenues, and then reduces the deficit to \$252.9 billion next year and then eliminates the deficit in total by fiscal year 1998.

For the past 12 years, the caucus has worked hard on these and other budgets. The alternative budget that we bring before our colleagues today attempts to address the failures of the past by taking into account the realities of the present.

To be sure, the Congressional Black Caucus understands that there continues to be a great deal of pain and suffering and so this alternative budget document reaches out to the homeless also and to the uninsured.

This alternative budget seeks to create new educational opportunities and then to replace the courage of drugs with a sense of hope and compassion to human needs.

Our alternative does not indicate any points of opposition to our President. It simply says that we can do better and we can, in fact, do more.

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, when all is said and done, the budget process and our alternative budget has less to do with poli-

tics than it does with the interests of the people who are affected by what we do. The alternative budget we present is fair. It does not pit one segment of our society against another. We are simply concerned that people's interests are protected. The only way we can seek to do that is by being fair and by being compassionate.

This budget we propose today is not about taxing and spending. The alternative budget is about investing and then ultimately receiving dividends on that investment, so we have a choice to pay now, or in fact we can pay later.

We come this afternoon to challenge this House, to confront the real problems of this Nation, and then, after confronting them, to set and make them right again. We are not here for form or fashion, to occupy a place on this floor, to use time or to posture ourselves in any other way.

We have come today to argue the issue of deficits and to argue that those deficits did not come about mysteriously. They came about through misguided priorities.

We are here to argue also for defense, but also out of a realistic understanding that the world has changed. The Warsaw Pact no longer exists. The Soviet Union is but a memory. The Berlin Wall has been reduced to a speed bump, and continued spending of huge amounts on star wars, B-1's and smart bombs while other nations are developing smart minds does not adequately and honestly deal with the people we represent.

We believe that small business development is absolutely crucial. While corporate America continues to downsize and to lay off, it is small business that continues to step forward. This budget embraces that concept and those individuals. It talks about housing and moves us in a real direction.

When the history of this era is written, let it not be said that this House and the Members of this House walked away from an opportunity to really bring about change, walked away from an opportunity, for whatever partisan political wrangling that we oftentimes get involved with, but instead, that we came forward because we were in the North and the South and the East and the West, that we were black and brown and yellow, that we wanted, with white colleagues and black colleagues and people from all sorts of walks of life, to fashion a document that we could bring to this House that we would be proud of, that seeks to reach out to the people of this Nation, wherever they may be.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that Members of this body give serious consideration to both the debate and to the challenge. The challenge is to do more than what we have come here for, and in doing so, to make our plight, which is the plight of the American people, something

that is manageable and sensible by realistic budget priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that there is a Member opposed, and we await the opposition debate. I reserve the balance of my time, and inquire of the Chair how much time remains on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute and 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a moment to, first of all, compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and I also, of course, want to pay deep respect to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] and the members of the Black Caucus.

I can tell the Member that I remember back just a few years ago when RON DELLUMS and I would come to the floor and I would get about 20 votes and he would get about 21 votes, for we came here because we believed in things. I have great respect for the document that has been put together, because I do believe it is intellectually honest. I think it is something that the Members have spent time putting together, defining their priorities, and frankly, as we cross the aisle and listen to the debate, there is an awful lot we can learn from the points that the Members make.

I have to say that the Members on this side of the aisle have graduated one from their class, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mike Espy, who reached across the aisle with Jack Kemp in the concept of home ownership reform, and now that gentleman, one of the leaders in the Democratic conference and in their caucus, is now a member of the President's Cabinet.

I come tonight standing in opposition, but really with deep respect for what the Members are trying to do. I just want to commend them for their commitment and courage for putting forward a program that they deeply believe in.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his kind and gracious remarks. I know they are heartfelt, and certainly received on this side in the same way.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the cochair of the House progressive caucus, the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] and the Black Caucus for the outstanding work they have done, not only this year but for many years, and as the conscience of America.

Mr. Chairman, the President's budget is a very good step forward. But it does not go far enough.

There are 16 million Americans who are unemployed or underemployed, and millions more who work for minimum

wage. If the economy is recovering we haven't seen it in Vermont. It is absolutely appropriate for the Congress to invest in our deteriorating infrastructure—the roads, bridges, mass transportation, and sewer systems which have been so long neglected. We must rebuild America and, in the process, create hundreds of thousands of decent paying jobs. That's the right thing to do and the alternative budget of the Black Caucus and the progressive caucus does it more strongly than any other budget proposal.

Mr. Chairman, it is not acceptable that 5 million of our children go hungry every day; that American kids sleep out on the street and lack adequate health care and that the United States continues to have, by far, the Highest rate of child poverty in the industrialized world. Ultimately, a nation will be judged not by the size of their nuclear arsenal, or by the number of aircraft carriers they possess—but by how they treat the weakest and most vulnerable members of their society—their children. The alternative budget of the Black Caucus and the progressive caucus provides more support for the children of America than any other budget proposal.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation must finally address the huge deficit crisis that we face. We must ask the very richest people in our society, the people who made out like bandits during the 1980's, to finally start paying their fair share of taxes. Further, with the end of the cold war, we no longer need to spend \$130 billion a year defending Western Europe and Japan. We can cut military spending substantially. The alternative budget provides more deficit reduction than the proposal offered by the budget committee.

Mr. Chairman, now is the time to show the American people that our government works for all the people—not just the wealthy and the powerful. Now is the time to pass the alternative budget of the Black Caucus and the progressive caucus.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my fellow freshman Republican, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I am here to oppose the proposal, because in many ways it is an improvement over what we are considering to amend. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] suggested that some of our problems have developed because of misplaced priorities. I totally agree. I think priorities probably are more important in determining how we spend our money, rather than increasing taxes.

I am a farmer from Michigan. For a moment, let us try to get some of the tax information out of the mow and down onto the barn floor where we can chew at it a little bit.

What is the goal in reducing deficit spending? I think the goal is to in-

crease savings in this country. This country has a smaller percentage of savings than any of the industrialized countries of the world. Part of that savings is a negative savings because of the overexpenditure of the Federal Government. Part of it is because we have become a consumption economy and we tend not to save, but we have been encouraged to spend, so part of the goal of reducing the deficit is to encourage the amount of money that is available for not only spending for a college education or a new home, but maybe, most importantly, having that money available to spend for improving business and expending business and buying new machinery and tools and equipment.

When we increase taxes, what are we doing? We are reaching into the pocket of what mostly is savings to reduce overspending of the Federal Government, which is a negative spending. In effect, if we are going to really end up with more money that is available to borrow, we have to reduce spending, rather than increasing taxes to deal with the deficit in this country.

I urge my colleagues to consider the fact that now the Federal Government spends half of the total savings of the private sector of the United States of America because of our overindulgence, because of our credit card economy, and our credit card motivations that are putting off the burden to future generations.

I agree with some of the goals and some of the aspirations. I would hope we could realign our priorities to achieve some of those needed objectives, rather than increase taxes.

□ 1840

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS], a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget. This budget demonstrates a true commitment to alleviating the human suffering that many Americans have experienced over the past 12 years. No longer must we sit idly by and cringe at the possibility of the President making an announcement that will take more dollars out of the home and food off the table.

When you support the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget, you will build upon what is good with the Clinton Economic Program. Yet, you will go further in investing in our human capital.

The disproportionate ratio of defense spending to domestic investment is outdated. The CBC alternative will use our peace dividend and invest in the programs people really need. This

package will create jobs, feed children, and educate our people.

The American people are screaming for change. Let us hear their cries, and once again invest in our people and their institutions. This investment will stimulate economic growth, and promote the democratic ideal of human dignity. We should do no less.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], who is a real expert on defense.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I just want to take this time during these very important budget deliberations to talk a little bit about defense, because this is one area in which we are chartered by the Constitution to provide for the common defense, that is as Members of Congress to see to it that we have adequate navies, armies, and now strategic systems to secure this country. And I think Members may not realize what has happened with respect to defense in this budgeting process.

First, George Bush in his 1993 through 1997 budget brought down the defense budget by \$50 billion. He asked Dick Cheney, he ask Colin Powell, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, to put together a budget that they thought will allow for adequate defense and yet secure much-needed dollars to help reduce the deficit, and they came up with a \$50 billion cut.

Now the Democratic budget that will be offered, the base budget that was offered by the Budget Committee, is going to pull defense down \$112 billion, actually \$127 billion in authority but \$112 billion in outlays below the Bush budget. So if we add the \$112 billion and the \$50 billion in cuts, we are actually now \$162 billion below the base budget. That is below what we agreed on in 1990 would be the adequate number of dollars needed for national defense.

Let me tell you a few things that are happening in the world right now that I hope are making the White House take a second look at the defense budget, and I hope would make Members of this body take a second look.

First, in the former Soviet Union we still have four states. That is Russia, the Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan, which have nuclear weapons. Now theoretically these weapons which happen to be aimed, incidentally, at the United States and our allies, are still under the control of the Soviet rocket forces or the Soviets strategic systems command. But we are not really sure what is going to happen with these missiles. We do not know who has the pink slip on them. The Ukraine is fighting to retain their missiles so that they have autonomous control over these missiles, these strategic warheads that can hit the United States. Mr. Yeltsin now

has been paralyzed by the hardliners in Congress. He cannot move. We do not know what is going to happen. Some intelligence analysts in the world say that Mr. Yeltsin will be gone in a few months. That has been said before, but nonetheless, this is a very dangerous situation.

If we move to Bosnia we still are in a very unstable situation which has a great opportunity for increased violence, a great opportunity or a great possibility that United States forces may at some time be required to move and respond. And we have to look at that situation and realize that we cannot just walk away from Europe because the confrontation with the Soviet Union in Europe seems to be winding down.

If we go to North Korea, we will see that the North Koreans just pulled out of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The North Koreans are building nuclear systems. And a further danger is that the North Koreans are building ICBM's and have ICBM capability to meet up with those nuclear weapons. There is a major danger there. They have a government that is very aggressive.

If we move further into the area of nuclear proliferation around the world, we see about 20 nations that are acquiring ICBM capability. They are acquiring ICBM capability and at the same time developing, as Libya did, chemical capability and nuclear capability.

So we are leaving this era of confrontation with the Soviet Union, we think we are leaving this era, but we are entering into a new era of terrorists with high technology. And what we are doing in this budget, in the Democrat-based budget is we are going far below and making far deeper cuts than the cuts that Secretary Aspin as the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee advocated.

Let me tell Members what Chairman Aspin said we ought to do in his so-called option C. He said we need to have enough strength to do a couple of things. We have got to be able to fight a Desert Storm conflict, and at the same time have enough left over to have a contingency operation and also carry out air operations should North Korea invade the South.

The Democrat-based budget is \$60 billion below that Aspin level that is manifested on this chart.

We should vote against the Democrat budget.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to share the Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus views with this august body. It is difficult in 2 minutes to try to unload the last 12 years of heavy deficit burden that has been placed on our shoulders.

Nevertheless, very few people have the courage to admit that the only way we can handle this is cut back spending, and yes, get beyond the fiscal policy that exists in "read my lips."

President Clinton has had the courage to state that the only way that we can do it is increase taxes as we move forward to cut spending, and always to remember that unless we have all of our Americans working and productive that we are losing not only our competitive edge, but we are losing the ability to raise revenues. To that end we have lauded the President's efforts and believe that we can do better, and that we can do more, that we do not need an energy tax, even though we do have the earned income tax credit. We can remove that and start moving toward weatherization, that we do not have to put caps, remove the expansion of the Social Security tax from 50 percent to 85 percent, put to do something that people do not like to do, to say that we are prepared to increase the taxes to pay for that.

So what we have done is increase the individual taxes from 36 to 38 percent, put a surtax on the corporate tax making a combination of \$12.2 billion increase, increase the capital gains tax from 28 percent to 31 percent raising another \$3.5 billion, putting a cap on mortgage deductions and removing the \$1 million principal that we have, bringing it to a more realistic \$300,000, taking away the second home deduction.

□ 1850

By combining this, what we have done is reduced the deficit by \$15.1 billion and increased revenue by \$23.7 billion. It is a good way to go, and I thank the efforts of both the caucuses, Progressive and Black, for allowing us once again to present our views to the House.

Some are attacking the Congressional Black Caucus budget for its revenue provisions. As I said in the debate last night the caucus has generally been ahead of its time when it comes to tax provisions.

For a long time it pushed the concept that it made no sense to tax the working poor; and in the Tax Reform Act of 1986 Congress took millions of working poor off the tax rolls. Similarly it has been pushing for tax incentives to deal with social inequities and they have been recognized in the low-income housing tax credit and the targeted jobs tax credit that we applaud are being made permanent in this proposal.

The caucus has, in every budget it has presented, called for fiscal responsibility while being able to address the problems of our Nation that required investment in people now if we are to avoid the cost of failure in our communities in the future.

The Congressional Black Caucus always recognized that during the Reagan-Bush years that the tax system was skewed to help the rich with the belief their wealth would trickle down for everyone else. This policy resulted in

outrageous redistribution of wealth during the decade and in a failure to invest in our people. The caucus was always ready to challenge this empty fiscal policy of "Read my lips."

The Congressional Black Caucus always believed, as the American people are now so clearly indicating, that they are ready to sacrifice and redirect their resources to invest in the future.

The Congressional Black Caucus applauds the President's budget. It is a major step forward in the investment in our people that we need so desperately if we are to turn around the drain on our economy from poverty, drugs, crime, and despair. But, we and the progressive coalition believe we can do better. We offer a tax proposal that is more progressive and is part of the budget that will reduce the deficit to a level even lower than either the President's budget or the Budget Committee's product while providing comparable, if not more concentrated, investment in our people.

On taxes, we strongly stand by our time-honored belief in a more progressive tax code.

That is why we remove the broad-based energy excise tax. That and do not include expanded taxation of Social Security for retirees with incomes as low as \$25,000. We know that the increases in the earned income tax credit, energy assistance, and the food stamps will provide some cushion, but we know how bad poor people have had it for the past decade and we know that these offsets are not likely to be sufficient to make up for their losses and the addition of these increases in energy costs.

We cannot understand why we have to continue to subsidize luxury housing while so many are still homeless or ill housed or doubled or tripled up in inner-city apartments. That is why the Congressional Black Caucus would drop the limit on the mortgage from \$1 million to \$300,000 of principle and eliminate the deduction for second homes.

We are fearful, as many economists are, that with a higher marginal tax rate for the well-off that the 28 percent rate for capital gains will only encourage the gaming and sheltering that we saw prior to the 1986 reform act. Therefore, we would raise the capital gains rate to 31 percent. There will still be a differential, but not as great.

We believe that the corporations in the Nation must also pay their fair share and that it makes sense to keep the top corporate and individual rates close together. Therefore, the Congressional Black Caucus proposes to raise the corporate rate to 38 percent.

I have always been proud of the Congressional Black Caucus budget. In past years we have found our budget too far away from the one that comes down from Pennsylvania Avenue. Today, we are pleased that our proposal and the President's are so much closer together in numbers and in spirit. Because we know that we have to reduce the deficit, cut the overgrowing burden of interest costs, and redeploy our assets to win the economic war of competition by investing in all our people, including those who have, or are on the verge of, losing hope if we are to ensure a better America for all our children.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the Congressional Black Caucus for its serious and intellectually honest effort to present a budget alternative.

While I disagree with the details of this budget, I want to affirm that there is no problem in America more important than saving the inner city, no problem in America more important than addressing the concerns of the poorest and neediest of Americans.

I look forward very much to working with this reinvigorated and expanded Black Caucus in finding some common and bipartisan efforts to truly help the neediest of Americans.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I would like the RECORD to indicate that in the past where there have been programs targeted to help the poor and the homeless that the gentleman from Georgia has been cooperative, and we in the caucus look forward to any way that we can work together starting today.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE], a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the first time since the end of the cold war our country will be allowed to make significant reductions in our national defense budget, finally realizing the elusive peace dividend.

There is a national consensus that we have an obligation to place most of the savings to take better care of our domestic needs by stimulating the economy, creating jobs, and reducing the national debt. But, at the same time, the Congressional Black Caucus takes the strong position that we also have an obligation to right the wrongs of this same cold war, problems that were created in Africa.

Looking at Somalia as a perfect example, no guns are manufactured in Somalia, but there are more guns in Somalia than any country in the world per person. We say that African countries were used as pawns by both the United States and the former Soviet Union in the cold war. In some countries, the two world powers switched alliances, like in Somalia, as some colleges switch basketball coaches.

We have a moral obligation as Americans who have always stood for fairness and humanitarian values to do the right thing now.

We support the reauthorization of the \$100 million flexible fund for the Africa Relief, Rehabilitation, and Recovery Fund, also the United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking, and the United Nations specialized agencies

like UNICEF, UNHCR, and UNDP which will also require additional support. The United States should pay up all of its back dues.

We finally request that the African Development Fund receive \$1 billion for fiscal year 1994, an increase of \$200 million. This is an investment in the future in sustainable development for an environmentally free African continent. America can do no less.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I came to Washington 12 years ago with Ronald Reagan.

After 4 years of having liberal Democrats control both Houses of Congress and the Presidency, our country was left with the highest interest rates and the highest inflation in this century. We had higher unemployment rates and a negative growth rate than what we have today.

As we set out to clean up the mess, all we heard for the last 12 years was carping and nitpicking from the liberals who put us in the hole in the first place. Over and over again, our program of low taxes and deregulation and controlled spending was ridiculed as trickle-down economics.

No matter how the liberals want to rewrite history, the 1980's resulted in at least moderate improvement in the well-being of Americans at every income level. That is because they were focusing on job creation in the private sector, on rewarding hard work and investment, and on relieving the economy-killing tax and regulatory burden on the people. Almost 20 million new jobs were created with low inflation, low interest rates, and decreasing unemployment. We killed the stagnation monster created by the irresponsibility of the Democrats.

By the way, all the liberals and leftist professors who claimed the Reagan years were so bad have intentionally put the last 2 years of the Carter administration into their calculations of how they analyzed the Reagan years. Those years were so bad that they would drag down any analysis of what the Reagan years are all about.

Yes, the deficit did go up under the Reagan years, but let me say that had the same economic figures and the same economic trends that continued during the Carter years, had it continued during the Reagan years, we would have had a much higher deficit much earlier on.

Well, now the liberal spenders have again captured control of both Houses of Congress and the Presidency. What do they propose to do? Enact the largest tax increase in American history, and they promised not to hit the middle class, and now they propose to clobber the middle class and everybody else.

In 1990 these very same liberal Democrats pressured George Bush into a tax increase in the name of scaling back spending. Well, the spending was never scaled back. I predicted then it would knock the legs out from under the economy and throw people out of work and result in a higher, instead of lower, deficit. That is exactly what happened, and George Bush lost his Presidency in the process.

Incredibly, the economic hardship created by their last tax increase is now being used to justify another tax increase and a further increase in spending which they call stimulus spending—1990 was really the end of the Reagan economic era.

Today, however, we make it official. This budget makes it official. They are back in control, and I predict the economy is going down, and they are going to have to take credit for it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], a fellow freshman.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to register my opposition to the \$16.2 billion so-called stimulus package that the House will vote on today. This package will add \$16.2 billion to the deficit at a time when Americans want the deficit cut.

I would like to point out some of the items in this appropriations package. These items do not constitute an emergency and they will not create jobs—\$28 million to forgive D.C.'s budget deficit; \$117 million for the National Institute on Standards and Technology; \$22 million for historical preservation; \$23 million to promote a green agenda; \$28 million for alternative fuel vehicles; \$148 million to the IRS for new equipment; and \$38 million for buildings at the Agricultural Research Service.

The list goes on the on. This package is full of pork to pay off political constituencies. Everyone gets something. Everyone except the American taxpayer who gets stuck with the bill.

The administration claims that this stimulus package, which will cost \$30 billion when the tax incentives are added, will create 500,000 jobs. Even if this were true, each job is costing \$60,000. This is ridiculous when the private sector can create a job for \$40,000. And the truth is that this deficit spending program combined with the Democrat tax hikes will destroy more jobs in the private sector than it will create in the Government sector.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my fellow freshman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA].

□ 1900

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I brought my 7-year-old daughter, Alicia, to the floor with me when I voted. Looking at her optimistic face, it troubles me to think that Congress

is running up massive expenses that will burden her 20 years from now when she is starting her family and career.

Think about it—today's purchases will be tomorrow's headaches for your children and mine.

Is it not ironic that our voting cards are about the same size as a credit card. The spend now, pay later credit card addiction runs rampant in Congress. Members of Congress just insert their cards in a slot and run up the Nation's bills without worrying about paying for them right now.

But eventually someone will have to pay these bills.

Today we will be voting on a budget which promises deficit reduction but delivers debt. I urge my colleagues to think about the future happiness of our children and the future strength of our country when they vote today.

Let us not use our voting cards as credit cards to run up the Federal deficit. Let us be responsible and vote against this budget.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, like many of the Republicans, I admire the Black Caucus budget. Unlike them, I plan also to vote for it. The caucus has done the best job, it seems to me, of any of the budgets presented to us in allocating spending according to where it ought to go. No budget is perfect. There are elements of this I would disagree with; when specific implementation came forward, I would vote against one or two pieces. But overall they have done the best job in saying that the victory of the United States in the cold war frees up substantial resources for us to use elsewhere.

They correctly point out that many of those resources in the first instance should go to easing the pain and transition of those who have served this country. The Black Caucus budget deals very well with the short-term problem of those who will be disadvantaged, but it does by far the best job of taking advantage over the longer term of providing funds where we need them: Clean water, housing, et cetera. In the United States this is the best budget for putting the resources where they need to be. If it fails, I will be pleased to vote for the second best budget, but this is the best one today.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Black Caucus, and I also agree that they have made an effort. Let me talk about a few areas that I would totally disagree, as a businessperson.

I was at Miramar Naval Air Station just 2 weeks ago, and a young man came up to me, he was a pilot. He said, "DUKE, I am an American; I am not an African-American. I want to explain to you why. I was an enlisted man, and I worked real hard in the Navy and the officers noticed me and they recognized me for the officer program. I worked hard in the officer program, and they elected me to go to pilot training." He is now a young pilot.

Many of the young men and women that serve in our military forces today receive an education by far better than they would in any vocational school that exists in this country today, better than you would from any conversion dollars that you will use today.

I think when you cut the military, you also cut the minority programs. Last week, two of our Democratic Senators from the State of California stood up and said, "We don't want any of our bases to be closed. It impacts our economy too much." But those same two Senators 3 days ago voted to cut \$127 billion from the defense programs. You cannot have it both ways. What we need to take a look at, I think, is a balanced defense program that not only aids the military but defends this country and at the same time provides those programs for the inner city. I want to remind the gentleman from the other side that the 29th of March is the anniversary of the Los Angeles riots. If we really want to do something, we need to come up and get some programs that affect those areas.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS].

Mr. TOWNS. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to my good friend, the gentlemen from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] that this budget deals with the Los Angeles riots. That is what this budget is all about. It deals with the problems in terms of what happened in Los Angeles.

Mr. Chairman, over the past 12 years, America has been gutted. The inner cities and rural areas have been decimated by Government policies which taxed the middle class and gave the rich tax breaks. The scheme bankrupted America, destroyed the spirit of this country for millions of her people, and created a culture of greed and expediency which continues to eat away at the foundations of this country. It is time to rebuild America and place the firm foundation of the American dream in every heart. The CBC alternative budget is the only measure which can do this.

Our budget provides meaningful economic opportunities for those citizens who are able and willing to work, own and become active participants in the economic life of our country. It provides a helping hand to those who have

been displaced by changes in the civilian economy or the military atmosphere. It is a sane and humane response to the deeply entrenched and longstanding problems in this Nation.

It is in this budget alternative that their hopes can be made real and their dreams can be given a chance. It is in this budget to rebuild America and provide hope and a change to people who have struggled with unbearable hardships for 12 long years but who refuse to go away and be forgotten. It is in their names that we offer this budget to rebuild their hopes and give their lives and dreams a chance. It is only through this kind of intense infusion of assistance and revenue raising that we can begin to heal the economic hemorrhage that has sapped the lifeblood from every artery in this country.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

The clerk read as follows:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana moves that the committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that resolving clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, it is 5 minutes on each side, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for interrupting the proceedings, but we have a very important reason for doing that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mrs. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. First, I want to applaud my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME], who has spoken so eloquently in behalf of the Black Caucus alternative. Because of my deep respect for him and his beliefs, I wish I could go along with it. However, as I understand it, this alternative calls for substantial hike in taxes.

Mr. Chairman, somewhere along the line many Members in this House are forgetting that the American Revolution was kicked off as a result of taxes, more specifically taxes without representation.

For example, Mr. BURTON and I were prevented from bringing our plans, which are parallel, because they call for a flat freeze of all Federal expenditures plus 2-percent increase across the board. This combination would balance the budget by the year 2000 without any increase in taxes of any kind, and that would help not only those areas that the Black Caucus want to boost as

well as all America, again without raising taxes.

The only real difference between Mr. BURTON's and mine is that I included reconciliation language instructing the Committee of the Whole to reduce what the budget experts say was necessary, the expenditures, by \$17.1 billion.

□ 1910

I wanted that so it could be seen by everybody that the budget process was taken out of the back rooms and on to C-SPAN for the public to see. This is the only time the whole budget would be in front of Congress and all Members should be allowed to offer their alternatives, to offer specific budget cuts.

That is the way it should be, in my opinion. An example. I would cite the efforts of many people to cut the honey subsidy, but the merits of that subsidy should be weighed against everyone else's—in one forum, in one discussion.

When production line workers from McDonnell-Douglas lose their jobs to DOD cuts, these workers have a right to know why. If we show them that their paychecks are being taken away so that others can receive subsidies of one kind or another, these workers will understand what is going on.

That is honesty. We owe them that.

We all need a chance to have more than an up or down vote. I could not support the Kasich program because my constituents are impacted by cutting Amtrak and the Federal workers would be treated unfairly. I wanted to offer amendments, but no rifle shot amendments were made in order.

During the discussion on the rule, Mr. BEIL-ENSON made reference to the fact that some of the proposed amendments would have taken much time on the floor, and the Rules Committee nixed them.

I think the majority was wrong. I believe the country does want to see honey subsidies, defense, and highways debated. In my opinion, last year's election was a referendum on opening up the process.

Since I first proposed an across-the-board freeze in 1988, I have talked to many people, from farmers to seniors to veterans to Federal workers. They all say the same thing: "The budget should not be balanced on my back alone." All of them have been willing to shoulder the burden—if everyone else also does.

Equity, and equity alone, should drive the budget talks.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her kind comments.

Let me just say that we have not had the luxury of bringing our freeze plus 2 percent to the floor for a vote because the Rules Committee would not allow it; so what we have had to do all day long is find a way to bring this to the floor so that people could vote up or down whether or not they want a freeze plus 2 percent, which will get us to a balanced budget by the year 2000 without a tax increase.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that our program will not hit the COLA's of sen-

ior citizens on Social Security or Federal employees or military retirees. It is a program that will work under the 2 percent cap, and we can get to a balanced budget without the \$402 billion in tax increases that President Clinton wants and it will do the job.

The only problem is, it pinches some toes. The American people are willing to sacrifice, but they do not want to spend more taxes. They want us to take a meat cleaver to spending. This is the way to do it.

My colleagues, we will be having a vote on this, so if you are for the freeze plus 2 percent instead of these huge tax increases, I hope you will support the Bentley-Burton proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, obviously I rise in opposition to the motion. We are proceeding with the debate. We intend to move to the conclusion of the budget resolution this evening.

I would urge Members to vote "no" on the Burton motion.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in support of the position enunciated just a moment ago by the chairman of the Budget Committee.

We believe that striking the enacting clause of this bill is the wrong thing to do. It has been an orderly process. We hope to continue that way.

We recognize there are diverse and oftentimes clashing differences on the budget that have been before us, both this budget proposal and the two preceding ones, but we believe quite frankly that to strike the enacting clause is the wrong thing to do and would urge Members to resist the gentleman's motion.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 122, noes 302, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

AYES—122

Allard	Boehner	Diaz-Balart
Archer	Burton	Doolittle
Armey	Buyer	Dornan
Bachus (AL)	Callahan	Dreier
Baker (CA)	Canady	Duncan
Baker (LA)	Castle	Dunn
Ballenger	Coble	Emerson
Barrett (NE)	Collins (GA)	Everett
Bartlett	Combest	Ewing
Bateman	Cox	Fawell
Bentley	Crane	Fields (TX)
Bilirakis	Crapo	Fowler
Blute	Cunningham	Franks (CT)
Boehrlert	DeLay	Franks (NJ)

Gallely	Leach	Ros-Lehtinen
Gallo	Levy	Roth
Gekas	Lightfoot	Royce
Gingrich	Linder	Santorum
Goodlatte	Livingston	Saxton
Goss	Machtley	Schaefer
Grams	Manzullo	Smith (MI)
Greenwood	McCandless	Smith (NJ)
Hancock	McCollum	Smith (TX)
Hefley	McHugh	Solomon
Herger	McInnis	Spence
Hoekstra	McKeon	Stearns
Horn	Meyers	Stump
Huffington	Michel	Sundquist
Hunter	Moorhead	Talent
Hutchinson	Nussle	Thomas (WY)
Inglis	Oxley	Torkildsen
Inhofe	Packard	Upton
Jacobs	Paxon	Vucanovich
Johnson (CT)	Petri	Walker
Johnson, Sam	Pombo	Weldon
Kim	Quinn	Williams
King	Ramstad	Wolf
Kingston	Ravenel	Young (AK)
Knollenberg	Roberts	Zeliff
Kyl	Rogers	Zimmer
Lazio	Rohrabacher	

NOES—302

Abercrombie	Dingell	Kanjorski
Ackerman	Dixon	Kaptur
Andrews (ME)	Dooley	Kasich
Andrews (NJ)	Durbin	Kennedy
Andrews (TX)	Edwards (CA)	Kennelly
Applegate	Edwards (TX)	Kildee
Bacchus (FL)	Engel	Kliczka
Baessler	English (AZ)	Klein
Barcia	English (OK)	Klink
Barlow	Eshoo	Klug
Barrett (WI)	Evans	Kolbe
Barton	Fazio	Kopetski
Becerra	Fields (LA)	Kreidler
Beilenson	Filner	LaFalce
Bereuter	Fingerhut	Lambert
Berman	Fish	Lancaster
Bevill	Flake	Lantos
Bilbray	Foglietta	LaRocco
Bishop	Ford (MI)	Laughlin
Blackwell	Frank (MA)	Lehman
Billey	Frost	Levin
Bonilla	Furse	Lewis (CA)
Bonior	Gejdenson	Lewis (FL)
Borski	Gephardt	Lewis (GA)
Boucher	Geren	Lipinski
Brewster	Gibbons	Lloyd
Brooks	Gilchrest	Long
Browder	Gillmor	Lowey
Brown (CA)	Gilman	Mann
Brown (FL)	Glickman	Manton
Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	Margolies-
Bryant	Goodling	Mezvisinsky
Bunning	Gordon	Markey
Byrne	Grandy	Martinez
Calvert	Green	Matsui
Camp	Gunderson	Mazzoli
Cantwell	Gutierrez	McCloskey
Cardin	Hall (OH)	McCrery
Carr	Hall (TX)	McCurdy
Chapman	Hamburg	McDade
Clay	Hamilton	McDermott
Clayton	Hansen	McHale
Clement	Harman	McKinney
Clyburn	Hastert	McMillan
Coleman	Hastings	McNulty
Collins (IL)	Hayes	Meehan
Collins (MI)	Hefner	Meek
Condit	Hilliard	Menendez
Conyers	Hinchey	Mfume
Cooper	Hoagland	Mica
Coppersmith	Hobson	Miller (CA)
Costello	Hochbrueckner	Miller (FL)
Coyne	Hoke	Mineta
Cramer	Holden	Minge
Danner	Houghton	Mink
Darden	Hoyer	Moakley
de la Garza	Hughes	Mollinari
de Lugo (VI)	Hutto	Mollohan
Deal	Hyde	Montgomery
DeFazio	Inslie	Moran
DeLauro	Istook	Morella
Dellums	Jefferson	Murphy
Derrick	Johnson (GA)	Murtha
Deutsch	Johnson (SD)	Nadler
Dickey	Johnson, E. B.	Natcher
Dicks	Johnston	Neal (MA)

Neal (NC)	Rowland	Stupak
Norton (DC)	Roybal-Allard	Swett
Oberstar	Rush	Swift
Obey	Sabo	Synar
Oliver	Sanders	Tanner
Ortiz	Sangmeister	Tauzin
Orton	Sarpalius	Taylor (MS)
Owens	Sawyer	Tejeda
Pallone	Schenk	Thomas (CA)
Parker	Schiff	Thornton
Pastor	Schroeder	Thurman
Payne (NJ)	Schumer	Torres
Payne (VA)	Scott	Torricelli
Pelosi	Sensenbrenner	Towns
Penny	Serrano	Trafficant
Peterson (FL)	Sharp	Tucker
Peterson (MN)	Shaw	Underwood (GU)
Pickett	Shays	Unsoeld
Pickle	Shepherd	Valentine
Pomeroy	Shuster	Velazquez
Porter	Sisisky	Vento
Poshard	Skaggs	Visclosky
Price (NC)	Skeen	Volkmer
Pryce (OH)	Skelton	Walsh
Rahall	Slattery	Waters
Rangel	Slaughter	Watt
Reed	Smith (IA)	Wheat
Regula	Smith (OR)	Whitten
Reynolds	Snowe	Wilson
Richardson	Spratt	Wise
Ridge	Stark	Woolsey
Roemer	Stenholm	Wyden
Rose	Stokes	Wynn
Rostenkowski	Strickland	Yates
Roukema	Studds	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Clinger	Maloney	Taylor (NC)
Faleomavaega	Myers	Washington
(AS)	Quillen	Waxman
Ford (TN)	Romero-Barcelo	
Henry	(PR)	

□ 1935

Mr. PORTER and Mr. MILLER of California changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ZELIFF, ROTH, THOMAS of Wyoming, MCINNIS, EMERSON, STUMP, McCANDLESS, PAXON, DORNAN, STEARNS, GALLEGLY, COBLE, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, would it be a violation of the rules of the House to characterize a Member as petulant and puerile for continuing to call a series of unnecessary rollcall votes to interrupt the business of this House and the orderly debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that that is not a proper parliamentary inquiry.

The Chair would announce that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 11 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate first the Black Caucus for coming up with a budget. Having been a freshman mem-

ber of the Committee on the Budget. I know how hard it is to put a budget together. I hope their budget gets much more respect from their side of the aisle than our budget did.

Mr. Chairman, in my district in southwest Florida where we have a large number of retirees and small businesses, my constituents have said, "DAN, we are willing to make a sacrifice, we are willing to contribute, but we want to make sure the Government does their fair share first."

Mr. Chairman, that is the basic problem with this plan and the next plan we are going to be voting on. This plan asks for the people to give now and the Government is going to sacrifice some years in the future, maybe in the 104th Congress or the 105th Congress, when many of the Members in this room will not even be here. That is when they are going to sacrifice.

Mr. Chairman, that is the problem with this plan, that it does not have spending now and spending first.

The other problem is when we talk about jobs and the economy and stimulating the economy, I do know a little bit about that as a businessman and a former college professor in business school. What that tells me is I do not understand what economic theory tells you that more taxes generate jobs and stimulates an economy.

□ 1940

Basic Economics 101 tells us more taxes has that reverse effect. In fact, some studies have been out. DRI-McGraw Hill predicts in 1997-98 more than 700,000 jobs will be lost as a result of the fiscal drag due to the tax increases in the Clinton plan. And this plan is even worse. This plan raises taxes by \$421 billion more than the Clinton plan. It increases spending by \$141 billion more on the domestic side.

The Goldman Sachs report says the same thing. Taxing income reduces work effort and will yield less revenue than expected.

The people in Florida in my district are saying, "We need to cut the spending first." That is the best way to stimulate the economy, not by raising taxes now and spending at some future date.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget, with particular appreciation for the way they dealt with function 150.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the sponsors of the Congressional Black Caucus budget for what I view as innovative, farseeing approaches to a number of our national challenges.

Specific among these is the Caucus budget's proposal for international affairs—function

150. The CBC budget allows prudent but needed increases for the function, to fund critical national needs in peacekeeping and development aid.

In the development assistance area, the CBC budget includes much-needed increases for the Africa Development Fund. This is consistent with campaigns that I have participated in in years past to restore and maintain the ADF account at \$1 billion.

In doing this, the CBC budget's authors have recognized the fundamental reality of our changing definition of national security. Foreign aid, which accounts for less than 1 per cent of our Federal budget, is a priceless investment providing huge returns to the American public.

Foreign aid is in our political interest. Economic security contributes to political stability and a world that is safer for our children. U.S. development assistance is a vital tool to help children escape disease, starvation, and the ravages of epidemics.

Foreign aid is also our economic interest. By the year 2000 four out of five consumers will reside in developing nations. These countries already provide markets for more than \$128 billion, or 30 percent, of U.S. exports, supporting over a million American jobs. Without sustained economic growth, the purchasing power of the developing world will decline. Economic assistance increases the effective demand of foreign markets.

Bilateral foreign aid is cheap: less than one percent of the total Federal budget and a fraction of a percent of GNP. Foreign aid has also taken more than its share of budget cuts during the Gramm-Rudman years, slashed from a total of over \$19 billion to \$15.8 billion since fiscal year 1985.

I may have one or two problems with other areas of the CBC budget but, as I indicated, I commend its authors for their constructive approach on international affairs. I intend to vote for their substitute, and urge like-minded Members to join me.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget presented by the Black Caucus, a real investment for America's children and America's families and urge its passage.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAMBURG].

Mr. HAMBURG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the budget as presented by the Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the Virgin Islands [Mr. DE LUGO].

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the proposal of the Black Caucus and commend them for a proposal well thought out and a real investment in our country.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN].

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the Black Caucus for the tremendous job that he has done on this budget and rise in strong support of the budget.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, the rejection of the motion to strike all after the enacting clause was a very significant vote in that it showed a new attitude that now is sweeping through this Chamber with regard to this very important budget proposal, which follows a tradition of a dozen Congressional Black Caucus budgets that have been a part of this debate for as many years.

And I think that it is very appropriate that we notice that tonight this caucus is joined by yet another caucus in support.

We notice that the Members on the other side of the aisle have approached with the same conviction and seriousness and inquiry into the Congressional Black Caucus budget that the Members who put it together have, and I want to sincerely compliment those Members who have taken the time to examine our budget. I hope that they will join us in a vote.

In addition, we have a complementary staff report from the Committee on Government Operations that justifies the increased military reductions and the increased spending on the domestic side, because we have \$310 billion of existing cuts that can be made due to inefficiency and waste. The Vice President of this Nation is heading the task force to reinvent Government in that respect.

I would urge that everyone consider this budget in as careful a way as they can, because it is my belief that this budget will soon be the budget that we will test the will of the American people to turn this Federal Government around.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my fellow freshman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand here a copy of a one-page pictorial essay from Reader's Digest, January 1993. What it does is to rate the moral and ethical standards of several groups of people in our country:

Small business owners, 64 percent; journalists, big surprise, 39 percent; business executives, 31 percent; lawyer, 25 percent; Member of Congress, 19 percent.

Nineteen percent of the people in the country think that Members of Con-

gress have acceptable moral and ethical standards. I ask a question relative to the two votes that we are shortly going to make. Do my colleagues really believe that those voters out there, only 19 percent of whom believe that Congress has acceptable moral and ethical standards, really want this Congress to take their money and spend it for them?

I ask my colleagues to respect the intelligence, the wishes of the American people and please leave the money in the private sector where it will create jobs, real jobs and wealth. Honor their evaluation and the vote that they are making for what we ought to do in these next two votes.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Black Caucus values-based budget and compliment the gentleman for bringing this excellent product to the floor.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this is the first honest Presidential budget in 12 years. This amendment builds on that budget. It recognizes that while we must get the deficit under control, we must also get our economy in order.

We are investing in our public infrastructure at one-half the rate of our competitors. Private investment has decreased from 10 percent in the 1960's to 3 percent.

Our productivity is increasing at one-sixth the Japanese rate.

The President's budget starts us on the road to rebuilding our economy by investing in our country. This amendment recognizes that with the elimination of the Soviet military threat, we can do much more by shifting significant funding from defense to human infrastructure development.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM].

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, first let me congratulate the Black Caucus and also my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for a job well done in presenting some alternatives to this body. I wish we could have more of these kinds of elaborate debates and have the House work its will on a lot of other issues.

The reason I am coming here is because this package is being called a lot of things.

We heard in the Committee on Ways and Means that the real problem here and the real problem for this change that we want in this bill is because this has been a jobless recovery. I cannot tell my colleagues the number of times I have heard the President and Members on this side of the aisle say that

this has been a jobless recovery. We need to do something about creating jobs in America. We can have all this growth, as we did in the 1980's, but did not create job growth that we need.

□ 1950

This recovery is not a job growth kind of recovery. We are going to pass this package to create jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I want the Members to hear this. The administration's own numbers, their own numbers on unemployment over the next 5 years, look at them. We will be happy to give them to the Members.

By 1996, 1997, and 1998 and every year in between, the difference between their own projections, and Mr. Chairman, I agree that this is a bit of a laughing matter if we look at the difference between what will happen with the unemployment rate under the administration's own projections, between whether we pass this package and whether we do not.

In 1997, under the administration's own projections, the unemployment rate, if we do nothing today, if we do not change America, will be 5.8 percent. Under the plan, if the plan passes, do Members know what the unemployment rate will be, the dramatic growth of unemployment in America? Under their own projections, 5.7 percent, one-tenth of 1 percent.

This does not just apply to 1997. Look for every year in between, the same thing; 1-percent, one-tenth of 1 percent difference in growth of an employment. That, to me, to go and raise taxes a quarter of a trillion dollars over 5 years for one-tenth of 1 percent, is not a dramatic change in America.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I, like many of my colleagues, am very pleased that the President has submitted a budget that pays more than lip service to the needs of Americans, both poor and not so poor. I applaud his efforts, but I must say that the various budget proposals that have been debated on the floor of this body thus far have fallen short of the needs of my constituents who have been ignored by past administrations for far too long. The Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus alternative budget addresses these concerns.

For example, the CBC and Progressive Caucus budget increases the funding for several important programs including community development banks and the Community Reinvestment Act. Banks like Chicago's South Shore Bank and programs like the women's self employment project have shown the world that people can provide for themselves if given the opportunity through good lending programs. These initiatives provide entrepreneurial-

thinking low income citizens the ability to get capital to start businesses that will create for themselves and others a way out of poverty. I can think of no better way to invest in the future of America than to tap the potential that is dormant today among the poor of our country.

Further, the CBC budget puts a premium on education and training. It provides \$2 billion more in funding for the Pell Grant Program, specifically to raise maximum grant awards from \$2,300 to \$3,000. This change brings this program a little closer to the reality of college costs in 1993 which, as any of you with children can appreciate, have grown dramatically. The importance of this program cannot be overstated. Pell grants are a major way that we ensure that the hope of a better life exists for children growing up poor in America.

This budget provides \$2.4 billion in funding for substance abuse prevention and treatment. Drug-related crime is rampant in America in spite of what those of you who would end the Select Committee on Narcotics might think. Any budget we approve must provide for funds to tackle this very difficult problem. In some areas of the Seventh Congressional District there is the constant late night drug trafficking. Every recognized authority on the subject has pointed to the need for more treatment sources, and for the targeting of our resources on hard to reach and at risk populations as well as increased law enforcement. The CBC alternative provides for both.

Additional funds for transportation, community development block grants, and other infrastructure-building programs will shore up our physical communities while they provide needed jobs to fan the flames of the economic recovery which have only just begun to burn.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased today that the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus have offered this alternative. At some point we must focus on the social and economic disasters that our cities and communities have come to resemble. If not today, when? I urge my colleagues to support this reasoned and principled alternative budget proposal.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER].

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I overwhelmingly and unequivocally rise in support of the alternative budget that has been propounded by the CBC, the Congressional Black Caucus, and the Progressive Caucus.

As a new Member of Congress, I am enlightened by the fact that in this year if the President's budget proposal passes, we will fully fund Head Start. However, it has been edifying to me to

know that years ago the Congressional Black Caucus had the vision to fully fund Head Start through its alternative budget proposals.

It is enlightening to all of us to know that Members like the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] and the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] and many others have the vision that this country has needed for so long to do what is morally right.

When I hear people talk on the other side of the aisle about what is morally right, and then they talk about raising taxes, and when they raised taxes for 12 years but the taxes they raised never trickled down to the people who needed them, then I understand that they do not understand the meaning of morality.

Mr. Chairman, this budget may not pass tonight, but one day the fruits of its morality will be reaped.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman how many more speakers he has remaining.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I have two speakers remaining, but under the rule I reserve the right to close debate. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to conclude by saying that I congratulate the Black Caucus for bringing the issue up of this particular budget proposal. It brings up issues that are very important to us, of inner city problems and minority problems, and I think that need to be brought up.

In my district in Florida, which is mainly a retiree district, we have different issues and problems. I think it is important that we have had this dialog, and I congratulate them.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REYNOLDS].

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus substitute.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I specifically rise to support the alternative budget, but also specifically to respond to the two gentlemen from California, one of whom was kind enough to remind us that there is a provision in the Constitution that requires us to provide for the common defense, and the other of whom was kind enough to tell us the reasons we had riots in Los Angeles.

I want to remind them that there is in the same sense in the Constitution a requirement that we ensure domestic tranquility and promote the general

welfare. We will have difficulty doing that if the disparity between the rich and the poor continues to grow.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, to close debate, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] for his efforts, and thank him very much for giving me the privilege to close this debate.

Mr. Chairman, on more than one occasion I have stood either in the well of the House or in this place to suggest to all of my colleagues that the most important function in which we can engage is the business of establishing the national budget of this country, because the national budget in a very powerful and profound way reflects our values, our principles, and ultimately, our priorities.

It is thus against that backdrop, Mr. Chairman, that I rise with a great sense of pride and purpose to embrace and wholeheartedly support the budget articulated by my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus and the progressive caucus, because it speaks to the highest and the best in us. It is a budget based on courage, boldness, vision, dignity, and integrity.

It is rooted in two realities: on the one hand, the reality that the cold war is over, the Berlin Wall is down, and the Soviet Union has disintegrated; and the second reality, that our people are suffering in unprecedented terms, and we have a moral and intellectual, a political and economic obligation to address that human misery.

This budget is also rooted in the reality of conversion which ultimately, in the long term, will speak to the best of this Nation; fiscal conversion, on the one hand, allowing us to convert from spending billions and billions of dollars building a monument to military madness, on the one hand, to begin to address the myriad social problems of our fellow human beings on the other.

□ 2000

The military budget is capital intensive; the nonmilitary budget is labor intensive. Therefore, this budget has stated in clear and unequivocal terms that the extent to which you address the problems of the poor, the hungry, the malnourished, the underemployed, the undereducated, the infirm and the senior citizens of our society that you simultaneously, first, address social problems, and second, generate employment.

It is also rooted in the reality of structural conversion. How do we real-

ly convert from B-2 bombers to mass transit systems? How do we move from building weapons of destruction that we no longer need to enhance the quality of human life?

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus and the progressive caucus challenge each and every one of us here to the highest and the best that is in us. This moment is above politics. This moment should be beyond partisanship. This moment should be above parochialism. This moment should be rooted in principle, in dignity and integrity. And the extent to which you agree with me is the extent to which you will join my distinguished colleagues who have presented an extraordinary proposal to you to challenge us to our highest and our best.

I thank my colleague for this magnificent opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 87, noes 335, answered "present" 5, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

AYES—87

Abercrombie	Green	Rahall
Andrews (ME)	Gutierrez	Rangel
Becerra	Hamburg	Reynolds
Berman	Hastings	Richardson
Bishop	Hilliard	Roybal-Allard
Blackwell	Hinchey	Rush
Bonior	Jacobs	Sanders
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Schroeder
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Scott
Clay	Kennedy	Serrano
Clayton	Kopetski	Stark
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)	Stokes
Collins (IL)	Markey	Torres
Collins (MI)	McDermott	Towns
Conyers	McKinney	Tucker
Coyne	Meek	Underwood (GU)
de Lugo (VI)	Mfume	Unsoeld
DeFazio	Miller (CA)	Velazquez
Dellums	Mineta	Vento
Dixon	Mink	Washington
Engel	Moakley	Waters
Evans	Nadler	Watt
Fields (LA)	Norton (DC)	Waxman
Filner	Oberstar	Wheat
Flake	Olver	Williams
Foglietta	Owens	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Pastor	Wyden
Furse	Payne (NJ)	Wynn
Grandy	Pelosi	Yates

NOES—335

Ackerman	Baessler	Barton
Allard	Baker (CA)	Bateman
Andrews (NJ)	Baker (LA)	Bellenson
Andrews (TX)	Ballenger	Bentley
Applegate	Barcia	Bereuter
Archer	Barlow	Bevill
Armey	Barrett (NE)	Bilbray
Bacchus (FL)	Barrett (WI)	Bilirakis
Bacchus (AL)	Bartlett	Bliley

Blute	Hansen	Moorhead
Boehert	Harman	Moran
Boehner	Hastert	Morella
Borski	Hayes	Murphy
Boucher	Hefley	Murtha
Brewster	Hefner	Natcher
Brooks	Hoagland	Neal (MA)
Browder	Hobson	Neal (NC)
Brown (OH)	Hochbrueckner	Nussle
Bryant	Hoekstra	Obey
Bunning	Hoke	Ortiz
Burton	Holden	Orton
Buyer	Horn	Oxley
Byrne	Houghton	Packard
Callahan	Hoyer	Pallone
Calvert	Huffington	Parker
Camp	Hughes	Paxon
Canady	Hunter	Payne (VA)
Cantwell	Hutchinson	Penny
Cardin	Hutto	Peterson (FL)
Carr	Hyde	Peterson (MN)
Castle	Inglis	Petri
Chapman	Inslee	Pickett
Clement	Istook	Pickle
Clinger	Johnson (CT)	Pombo
Coble	Johnson (GA)	Pomeroy
Coleman	Johnson (SD)	Porter
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Poshard
Combest	Johnston	Price (NC)
Condit	Kanjorski	Pryce (OH)
Cooper	Kaptur	Quinn
Coppersmith	Kasich	Ramstad
Costello	Kennelly	Ravenel
Cox	Kildee	Reed
Cramer	Kim	Regula
Crane	King	Ridge
Crapo	Kingston	Roberts
Cunningham	Kleccka	Roemer
Danner	Klein	Rogers
Darden	Klink	Rohrabacher
de la Garza	Klug	Ros-Lehtinen
Deal	Knollenberg	Rose
DeLauro	Kolbe	Rostenkowski
DeLay	Kreidler	Roth
Derrick	Kyl	Roukema
Deutsch	LaFalce	Rowland
Diaz-Balart	Lambert	Royce
Dickey	Lancaster	Sabo
Dicks	Lantos	Sangmeister
Dooley	LaRocco	Santorum
Doolittle	Laughlin	Sarpalius
Dornan	Lazio	Sawyer
Dreier	Leach	Saxton
Duncan	Lehman	Schaefer
Dunn	Levin	Schenk
Durbin	Levy	Schiff
Edwards (TX)	Lewis (CA)	Schumer
Emerson	Lewis (FL)	Sensenbrenner
English (AZ)	Lightfoot	Sharp
English (OK)	Linder	Shaw
Eshoo	Lipinski	Shays
Everett	Livingston	Shepherd
Ewing	Lloyd	Shuster
Fawell	Long	Siskis
Fazio	Lowe	Skaggs
Fields (TX)	Machtley	Skeen
Fingerhut	Maloney	Skelton
Fish	Mann	Slatery
Ford (MI)	Manton	Slaughter
Fowler	Manzullo	Smith (IA)
Franks (CT)	Margolies-	Smith (MI)
Franks (NJ)	Mezvinsky	Smith (NJ)
Frost	Martinez	Smith (OR)
Galleghy	Matsui	Smith (TX)
Gallo	Mazzoli	Snowe
Gejdenson	McCandless	Solomon
Gekas	McCloskey	Spence
Gephardt	McCollum	Spratt
Geren	McCrery	Stearns
Gibbons	McCurdy	Stenholm
Gilchrest	McDade	Strickland
Gillmor	McHale	Studds
Gilman	McHugh	Stump
Glickman	McInnis	Stupak
Gonzalez	McKeon	Sundquist
Goodlatte	McMillan	Sweet
Goodling	McNulty	Swift
Gordon	Meehan	Synar
Goss	Meyers	Talent
Grams	Mica	Tanner
Greenwood	Michel	Tauzin
Gunderson	Miller (FL)	Taylor (MS)
Hall (OH)	Minge	Taylor (NC)
Hall (TX)	Molinari	Tejeda
Hamilton	Mollohan	Thomas (CA)
Hancock	Montgomery	Thomas (WY)

Thornton	Visclosky	Wilson
Thurman	Volkmer	Wise
Torkildsen	Vucanovich	Wolf
Torricelli	Walker	Young (AK)
Trafficant	Walsh	Young (FL)
Upton	Weldon	Zeliff
Valentine	Whitten	Zimmer

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Bonilla	Herger	Menendez
Gingrich	Inhofe	

NOT VOTING—8

Dingell	Ford (TN)	Romero-Barcelo
Edwards (CA)	Henry	(PR)
Faleomavaega	Myers	
(AS)	Quillen	

□ 2020

Mr. KYL, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Messrs. SEXTON, TAYLOR of North Carolina, BURTON of Indiana, KOLBE, and GOODLING changed their vote from "present" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to resume general debate on House Concurrent Resolution 64.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], will be recognized for 10 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, we have only one speaker, our concluding speaker. I understand the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has two, so I will defer to him.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, we have had 2 days of what I think has been particularly interesting, even at times scintillating debate between our two parties as we have contrasted two budget proposals representing the two contesting visions of public policy represented by our parties and the very substantial, real differences between our parties.

Now, the fact of the matter is the Democratic Party has control of the entire apparatus of Government.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States has submitted his proposal for a budget to govern the U.S. Government. It is a proposal that I disagree with as being either good Government, good public policy, deficit reduction or job creating.

As I see it, he has asked us to accept a proposal that gives us the single largest tax increase in the history of the country. At the same time we accept that tax increase now on virtually all Americans, he asks us to accept a Government spending program.

Drive this economy forward, the President says with one foot on the accelerator and the other on the brake. It

may work. I sincerely hope, for the American people, that the President's proposal works. But I doubt that it will. I think it is bad policy. I am obliged to say so out of respect to the President and out of duty to my constituents.

The fundamental problem that I have with the President's proposal is it will not work to achieve the desired ends of economic growth, job creation, revenue generation to the Federal Government, and then subsequently deficit reduction.

If I thought this program would work, I would ask you to vote for it. This program is based on the misguided idea that we can solve the problems of this country by growing the Government.

Let me just say I want to thank the Democrat majority; the old adage in politics is, "If you have the votes, vote; if you do not, debate." They have worked hard on their side of the aisle, the President has worked hard on their side of the aisle, and they have managed to get the votes on their side of the aisle to pass the President's program.

So, they did not have to allow us a debate, and yet they did. The feature of that debate was the Kasich Republican budget proposal. That proposal, in my judgment, won the debate. The hero of the 1993 budget debate is JOHN KASICH from Ohio because he met the challenge, he and his Budget Committee brought forth the detailed proposition to get an even greater deficit reduction by cutting the size of Government and allowing the private sector to grow. And when the private sector grows, as the 1980's have taught us, revenue accrues to the Government. And if we can grow the private sector and contain growth of the public sector, we can, as we put our children back to work in America, resolve the problem of the deficit.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and his proposal won the debate. You Democrats will win the vote, we know that. The President will be allowed to govern with his Democrat Party and the consequences will be felt and judged by the American people. But when that judgment is over and when those consequences are felt, if I am correct in my judgment of the vitality or the lack thereof of the President's proposal, if I am correct in my judgment of the correctness of the Kasich proposal and the vision represented by it, the American people will come back with a different conclusion some day at the polling place. If I am incorrect in my understanding, you Democrats will prosper as a party, as you should.

Mr. Chairman, I remain convinced that in the long run the American people will be governed by good public policy born out of correct, truthful understanding of our own history. They will

get that from the Republican Party, if not tonight, later. But eventually they will again get it as they got it in the 1980's under Ronald Reagan.

For tonight, let me say to my colleagues: If you think you can move the American economy forward with one foot on the accelerator of growing Government spending and the other foot on the brake of increased taxation on the American people, if you think that is good public policy, if you think that the solution to the problems of your children's future lies in a growing Government, vote for the Democrat proposal.

If on the other hand you think the simple, obvious truth borne out by the history of the American economy is that our Nation's greatness is found in our people's industry or our people's entrepreneurial spirit, our people's industriousness and that private enterprise and freedom works, and private sector growth serves our children's future, vote "no" for the Democrat proposal and vote "yes" for the Kasich proposal.

□ 2030

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, to close the debate, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the distinguished minority whip.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, let me first commend the Chair. I think this entire House can be very proud of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] for the clear, fair, and responsible job he has done today in a long and difficult debate.

I hope that we are maybe tippy-toeing a little bit into a different era, maybe.

I have to comment for a second, though, on what I think was a very destructive rules procedure today for both this bill and the one that will follow. You know, it represents a strategy of smother, denial, and division.

On the one hand, in the following bill we apparently sent up scores of motions to cut spending, of which surely a few were worthy of being voted on, but that was smothered.

The moderate and more fiscally prudent Democrats wanted to offer some amendments on the next bill, but that was denied.

We just saw a vote where frankly we deliberately withheld our side for awhile, because the Black Caucus had been told, unlike the moderate Democrats, "Oh, you can be made in order, you just can't be allowed to win."

I want to make clear first that the defeat was not on our side.

Second, I kept my vote "present" because I will not join your leadership in defeating it.

Now we come to where we are. Finally we are down to the leadership budget.

I must say for just a moment, I think not just the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], who has gotten a lot of praise and has earned every bit of it, but the entire Republican Budget Committee membership did exemplary work. They got the highest vote any Republican budget has got in 5 years and they put together an 84-page detailed budget, scored by the Congressional Budget Office which met the President's standards as enunciated up here, not the President's standards as sent to the Budget Committee, because the truth is there is \$112 billion in the budget you are about to vote on in additional defense cuts that are unspecified.

I have watched my friends from California, South Carolina, and across the country, talk about base closings under the Bush budgets, and now tonight you are being asked to cast a vote yes for \$112 billion below the number that I just heard some people say was already killing the vitally needed bases. Not only is that bad from a back-home standpoint, but you are being asked to cast a \$112 billion defense cut with North Korea in a crisis, Iraq, Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, and the current problems in Russia, a very strange time to be cutting \$112 billion additional in defense.

Then you are asked, despite what the President said to us that night when he was here, you are asked for \$63 billion in unspecified future domestic cuts.

Now, anyone who is serious about deficit cutting, who knows anything about the Congress, knows that \$63 billion unspecified cuts, as compared to an 84-page detailed budget, is just simply a game.

Finally, you are asked to vote for the largest tax increase in history. By the way, that translates in the first year which is the only year which is real, into a \$27 billion tax increase and a \$4 billion spending cut.

Ross Perot today said he wants \$2 in spending cuts for every dollar in tax increases. You are actually going to give the American people \$7 in tax increases for every \$1 in spending cuts; but of course, Ross Perot and his millions do not really matter to the Democratic majority.

Finally, about this tax increase which will kill jobs, remember, I stood here when the Republican President wanted to raise taxes and I said in 1990 that it will deepen the recession. It will increase unemployment. It will kill jobs.

Those of you who have a boat industry know what that tax bill did.

So what are you going to do this year? You are being asked to vote for an energy tax, not on the millionaires, on every American who uses energy, owns an electric lightbulb, heats a house, air conditions a house, drives a car, every rural American who drives a long distance, every person in agribusiness, every person who buys any

product delivered by a truck, probably the most inflationary tax you could invent.

Then you are being asked to punish every senior citizen who spent their working years saving. That is right. If you saved in America, the Democratic budget wants to punish you. Senior citizens are going to pay a bigger tax on Social Security if you vote yes.

Finally, this is the most antiagriculture, anti-rural America budget ever offered by an American President. As Pat Roberts has proven in the material he sent out analyzing the combined cost.

Medicare in rural hospitals, energy tax on gasoline, a tax on people who drive, the impact of the subsidy cuts in terms of agriculture itself, all these things come together as the most anti-rural American budget ever offered, and you are being asked to vote yes.

Now, there was once a movie which cast the Sundance Kid, in which they had no choice, so they locked arms, they said some words that I cannot repeat on the House floor, and they jumped off a cliff. Cute in the movie, because they have stunt men. There are no stunt men here.

This budget is intellectually unfair. It is not accurate. It does not meet the standards the President of the United States himself proclaimed down here. It is not a good document. It should not be voted on and it is not worthy of a "yes" vote. I urge you to vote "no."

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, a few months ago, a few days ago in November, the first Tuesday, about 62 percent of the American people cast their vote for substantial change. They were upset primarily I think about the economy. They wanted change in the economy. They were upset not only about unemployment, they were upset about underemployment. They were upset about what they believe is the loss of our standard of living.

They also wanted action. I think they wanted movement. They wanted an end to the argument, the gridlock, the perception of lots of debate and lots of back and forth, but at the end we were not moving. We were not acting.

An older constituent of mine in St. Louis the other day after the President's speech said to me, "I don't know that I agree with everything that Clinton wants, but I think you all had better get it done."

Tonight we can take the first giant step in getting it done, and as we do it tonight it is one of the earliest times that I can remember we have been able to pass a budget resolution.

It is a good budget and it is a good economic program.

President Clinton, Leon Panetta, someone known to all of us, other

members of the administration worked diligently and hard on it. In the short time they have had to put together this plan, much of it based on what President Clinton said in the election, much of it based on the facts and circumstances that they met as they came to office. What they met was a budget worse than they thought, worse than anyone thought. What they thought was about \$260 billion turned out to be over \$350 billion.

They did the best they could. They came up with what I think is a balanced program.

I think members of our caucus and the Budget Committee improved the program.

The President said here the other night that we live with the most conservative economic projections, and when the Congressional Budget Office came back with a re-estimate that said we were \$60 billion or so short over 5 years, members of our caucus in the committee, off the committee, went to work made hard decisions, offered further cuts, and those cuts are real. They may not all be lined out line by line, but one of the things we did in 1990 in the budget summit that was productive was that we established caps on spending, and those caps have worked, sometimes to our consternation.

□ 2040

These caps in this budget are real. We will not appropriate above these caps. I think they are better caps because we do not have walls between defense and domestic. We can make those decisions, the tension will be in the process, and we will vote at the end of the day on reconciliation, and each year in appropriations, and we will decide in that time, in that year, where the economy should go and where the spending decisions should be made. But it is real deficit reduction.

As the President said, we will take it from what is now about 5½ percent of GNP a year to about 2½ percent, rather it be no deficit. But given the situation they were presented with, this is substantial and real progress.

Second, he, in the plan, does something to make our tax system more progressive. I think that is very important. One of the things that has made people lose faith in Government, lose faith in their tax system, is the perception and the reality that the people at the top have gotten the greatest tax cuts while their income has increased the most while people in the middle and at the bottom have had their taxes go up the most while their income has gone down the most. And this budget, and the tax bill that will follow, will remedy that, and that is important to the faith, and the hope, and the belief of people.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this budget and this program has investments. President Clinton believes that something

fundamental is happening in our economy. He understands, and understood from the beginning, the start, of his campaign, that it would not be enough to simply get the deficit down, as important and as vital as that is. But he believes, and he told me the other day that he believes it strongly, and he talked about it from the beginning of his campaign, that we had to increase and change the role of government in aiding and abetting primarily what is a private effort in our economy, to create jobs, to create wealth, to create economic success.

Not everyone believes that, and I understand that. We would be in poor shape in this country if all of us believed exactly the same way to get to the goal.

But he believes, and I think most Democrats believe, that something fundamental is wrong with this economy.

We are in a new world. We face tough competition, not only from the Mexicans and the Chinas of the world, but from the Japans and Germanys of the world, and to face, and meet, and succeed with that competition we need a new economic program, a new way of trying to do things.

He believes in education; he believes that we have to better educate our people.

I often, in town hall meetings, have people say to me, "How can I compete against someone in Mexico or China who is earning \$1 an hour when I want to earn \$20 an hour?" It is the toughest question we face, and the only real answer is:

"It's not protectionism, it's not lowering our standard of living to meet theirs, both of which might work, but not for long. The only real answer is that that worker has to be as productive, as productive as the worker they're competing against in China or Mexico."

There is no other answer. President Clinton understands that. He makes investments over 5 years in the power of people with ultimately is the way we are going to be competitive and successful.

He invests in the infrastructure of our country. Japan will spend double what we will spend in the next 5 years on infrastructure, an island nation of 125 million people, a land mass the size of California, and they will be investing double what we will in infrastructure. What have they figured out that we have not figured out?

He invests in research. Not that government does most of the research, not that government even does a majority of the research, but frankly there are things that have to be done by government the private sector will never do. The space program was an example of that. What we do at the National Science Foundation, what we are doing at Semtech, is an example of a private-public partnership to keep us alive in

semiconductors, and 5 years ago we were dead in semiconductors. Today we are back in the game. We have got a majority again of the world market and a new way of addressing economic problems.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues tonight:

"I think we have a President who has a plan. You might not agree with it, but I think he deserves a chance. He deserves a chance. For 12 years the Republican Party has occupied the White House, and maybe you didn't feel that every year you got the program exactly the way you wanted it. But in 1981 I would submit to you that the basics of Reaganomics passed this body with many Democrats joining with many Republicans in voting for it. I was not in that group, but many here did, and the program was in place."

I want to quote what Dick Cheney said on this floor on May 7; I think it was 1981. He said, "We face a national problem. It is not a problem of the Republican Party or the Democrat Party. It is a problem of the United States of America. It is a problem that transcends partisan considerations, and the solution demands support from both sides of the aisle that separate this Chamber." He said, "The American people want to give President Reagan and his new programs a chance." He said, "They want to chart a new course, to try something new, something different, and they want the package that President Reagan has proposed." He concluded by saying, "The American people are watching what we do here today. They want us to act, and to act now."

My colleagues, I think the American people are watching tonight, and I think with all their heart and all their mind they want us to act on their behalf, and they want us to act now. The greatest thing that a President in a government can do, far beyond any program and far beyond any idea, is to give people hope and the feeling of faith that we are on the right track, that we are improving ourselves and that we have an idea of what we are trying to do to make the country succeed.

In the 1930's President Roosevelt came before this body and before the country, and he said, "All we have to fear is fear itself," and he changed people's attitudes. Bill Clinton in just 3 months changed dramatically people's outlook on where we were headed and where this country could go. People went from thinking we are on the wrong track to thinking we are, maybe, back on the right track. Confidence is up. Interest rates have gone down. The market has been up.

My colleagues, the one thing we need to do tonight to save the United States is to stand behind this young man. We want to give him a chance. We want our people to succeed. We want a new day for this country.

Tonight we have that chance, and I urge each of my colleagues, Republican and Democrat, to vote for this program, to give it a chance, and let us see if we can make this country great, and good, and strong again.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 64, the 1994 budget resolution and H.R. 1335, the 1993 Stimulus and Investment Supplemental Appropriations Act. As America looks to build a stronger economy, deficit reduction must be our top priority. I am pleased that the budget resolution and the stimulus package, together, represent a significant deficit reduction plan that will facilitate long-term economic growth and productivity. It is, in essence, President Bill Clinton's noble vision for the future, and it deserves our careful consideration and support.

The budget resolution, faces, straight on, the nearly \$200 billion structural deficit which is strangling our economy, and systematically robbing our children of any hope for inheriting an America that is fiscally sound and capable of maintaining her position as the world's leader in today's economy.

The time has come for us to make the difficult decisions in order to make right what has been wrong for far too many years. I firmly believe that the resolution will facilitate this critical decisionmaking process. By holding domestic defense as well as international affairs discretionary spending below fiscal year 1993 levels for the next 5 years, the resolution will significantly reduce the deficit by \$42.6 billion in fiscal year 1994 and by a total of \$510 billion by 1998. Indeed, this is a strategic plan which appropriately reflects America's changing needs and realignment of spending priorities.

There is no greater long-term threat to the economic and social well-being of our Nation than the enormous budget deficit which grew out of the misplaced priorities of the 1980's. Today I am encouraged, for this resolution, overall, proposes a fair and balanced combination of real spending cuts, tax reforms and entitlement changes which, for the most part, shares the burden of reform as equally as possible, phases in deficit reduction over a number of years, and most importantly, reassures that we are all in this struggle together. Adoption of this measure will, hopefully, mark the beginning of the end of deficit spending and the beginning of the long-awaited comprehensive deficit reduction process, that makes that possible.

What is even more encouraging—if not refreshing—is that the phony economic assumptions and other irresponsible accounting gimmicks have been cast aside. Finally, we are presented with a set of real numbers with which to set fiscal policy and which will empower us to make educated, and responsible, albeit difficult, decisions. I appreciate having the opportunity, and welcome the challenge, to make these critically necessary decisions.

Although for purposes of deficit reduction cutting spending must be our initial step, cutting discretionary spending alone is not enough to achieve our goals. Therefore, in addition to such cuts this plan calls for establishing real control over the growth in direct spending levels. The resolution proposes strategic

steps towards controlling entitlement spending which accounts for more than one-half of the national budget and is growing much faster than the economy as a whole. Similarly, the resolution reflects the need to undertake sweeping reforms of our medical system and anticipates a responsible strategy for controlling the escalating costs of health care, the fastest growing part of our Nation's budget.

Certainly, spending cuts alone are not going to solve our fiscal problems. H.R. 1335, the stimulus and investment package now before us is the final element of the overall economic recovery agenda.

The stimulus package will spur new growth and investment and allow the economy to expand on its own. The plan aims to invest in our country and its people by appropriating a greater commitment of funding to infrastructure improvements, job training and retraining and education to assure that we have the skilled work force we need to meet the changing demands of a global economy.

In addition, this stimulus package reflects a responsible industrial policy which provides our basic industries with financial assistance such as new sources of capital at reasonable rates, as well as tax incentives for research and development and investment. Further, progrowth, antipoverty tax initiatives such as the targeted jobs tax credit and the earned income tax credit and limited, targeted capital gains tax cut will be essential elements of the entire economic recovery process.

However, I want to be very clear about this plan. I do not agree with every detail of it. Indeed I have many concerns. First of all, it disturbs me that we are to consider appropriating additional funding for the initiatives outlined in the stimulus package before voting on and implementing the necessary budgetary cuts proposed in the budget resolution.

Moreover, we must find additional cuts in such programs as the \$30 billion space station, the \$10 billion superconducting super collider and many of our subsidy programs, which we just cannot afford. That should enable us to ease the pressure on the revenue side, which raises taxes on lower and middle income as well as high income Americans.

Additionally, I am troubled by the proposal to freeze the pay and COLA's of Federal workers. They have been on the short end for far too long. To the extent that Federal workers are singled out, the plan is taxing this group of Americans twice.

Also, I have strong reservations about the broad-based Btu tax which may result in hitting hard at the pocketbooks of working men and women. Similarly, I am concerned about the potential effect that tax may have on the competitiveness of certain American industries.

This plan is far from perfect but I do believe that overall this is a worthy plan which will put us on the right course for achieving our goals of deficit reduction and economic growth. Moreover, this is just the beginning of the budget process. I am hopeful that the Senate will include these additional spending cuts in its budget resolution. We must begin making the tough choices and lead our Nation through these difficult and challenging times. Today we have the opportunity to begin building an

America that is greater than ever, and second to none. Therefore I urge my colleagues to join me in accepting this challenge by supporting the 1994 budget resolution and H.R. 1335, the 1993 Stimulus and Investment Appropriations Act.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, since the President presented his economic plan to the Nation last month, people at home in Missouri have told me, "I think we should give his program a chance, but I would like to see more cuts."

Tonight, we can do both of those things. The \$63 billion in additional cuts proposed by several of us conservative Democrats, the freeze in discretionary spending, and more than \$500 billion in deficit reduction over 5 years, contained in the budget resolution, are steps in the right direction. The President's stimulus package includes short-term investment in our Nation, including rural America.

But the budget blueprint is the beginning of a long-term process of reducing the deficit and making our Nation more competitive in the world. As we make spending decisions this year, we have the opportunity for further debate, and the obligation to make sure we implement the cuts approved here tonight. I'm from Missouri, and you're going to have to show me and the rest of America the cuts will be made.

Last November, America voted for change. We must give this administration, and this Congress the chance to work, because if we succeed, our country succeeds.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise as ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee to express my concerns about House Concurrent Resolution 64 and the direction the House seems to be headed with the veterans' portion of the budget. Just this morning the Veterans' Affairs Committee had a budget hearing at which it received from a number of veterans' service organizations their independent budget proposals for fiscal year 1994 and a candid assessment of the proposals from the administration and the Budget Committee to the extent they have been revealed. What I heard was alarming.

The independent budget for veterans affairs is a comprehensive budget alternative which has been formulated annually for the past seven years by the American Veterans of World War II, Korea and Vietnam, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America and Veterans of Foreign Wars. Their budget proposal uses their own financial and staff expertise to identify to Congress the VA's actual needs and funding requirements without reference to budget driven constraints. Each year it has been presented, it has grown in sophistication and credibility to the point that it is one of the Veterans' Affairs Committee's most important references in analyzing the VA's budget requests. I commend them for the important service they are performing for Congress on behalf of all veterans.

The analysis of the proposals from the Administration and the Budget Committee lead to the conclusion that, if they are adopted, the VA health care system would move from its current state of chronic underfunding into an acute financial crisis. Ultimately, the proposals are a prescription for the collapse of the VA health care system as we know it. If you be-

lieve I exaggerate, consider the testimony of the veterans' service organizations that testified before the Veterans Affairs Committee this morning.

Here's what they said:

Disabled American Veterans—"If VA's discretionary spending is frozen at fiscal year 1993 levels for the next 5 years, VA's ability to deliver quality healthcare in a timely fashion will be severely compromised. This spending freeze, coupled with the nearly 7,000 VA healthcare employee cut mentioned in President Clinton's Vision for Change document, quite simply, will deny critically needed healthcare to tens of thousands of entitled veterans. * * * (W)e view the Budget Committee's recommendations as neither fair nor equitable or in the best interest of our Nation's sick and disabled veterans and their families. This budget again singles out veterans to shoulder a disproportionate share of Federal deficit-reduction."

Paralyzed Veterans of America—"The economic stimulus package specifies that 9,000 full-time employees will fall off VA's payroll over the next 5 fiscal years. Seven thousand of these employees would come from medical care. * * * The number of VA staff assigned to each patient is much lower than the number assigned in comparable settings. VA does not have the staff to meet preventive care needs or to fully implement effective case management programs—both found to be cost effective in care delivery."

AMVETS—"We must point out that spending (constant dollars) for all Federal social programs increased by 361 percent since 1965, while spending for veterans programs increased only 36 percent. * * * Having said that, AMVETS questions billions in new spending while cutting a net \$1.2 billion from VA accounts over the next 4 years. * * * At a time when the thrust of national healthcare reform policy is to broaden the coverage for our citizens, we do not understand and cannot accept a reduced level of services for veterans."

Non-Commissioned Officers Association—"A \$1 billion management savings is a smoke and mirrors goal which will eventually result in a decline in services to veterans."

The detailed budget request from the Clinton administration for the VA will not arrive until later this month. Those already announced features of it have been incorporated into House Concurrent Resolution 64. I am very concerned about the \$3.7 billion in cuts of mandatory spending being recommended for veterans' programs as part of budget reconciliation. Apparently, the money is simply being taken from veterans to finance enormous new Federal expenditures on social welfare programs.

My impression is that veterans are willing to sacrifice their fair share to reduce the deficit but not to finance more Federal spending elsewhere. House Concurrent Resolution 64 clearly passes veterans by as it distributes the peace dividend across the budget spectrum to nonveteran programs.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee receives many complaints from veterans about poor timeliness and quality of VA services. These problems are largely due to chronic underfunding of veterans' programs I have already alluded to.

It is going to be impossible for the VA to provide even its current level of services and benefits to veterans with \$1 billion of reduc-

tions in discretionary spending achieved by claimed savings from administrative streamlining of veterans' health care, as well as a reduction of 9,000 FTEE.

Furthermore, the Budget Committee's fiscal year 1994 discretionary spending level for VA is \$700 million below the CBO baseline. The Budget Committee's recommendation for fiscal years 1994 through 1998 approaches an incredible \$7 billion less. Cuts this big will lead to an unacceptable quality of health care for veterans.

Making budget comparisons and precise judgments is not possible without a detailed administration proposal for all Federal departments and agencies, but this much is clear:

First, veterans' programs are not the cause of the explosion in domestic spending which has fueled the deficit;

Second, veterans have already sacrificed for their country and should not be asked to accept deep program cuts in the name of deficit reduction when the budget package claiming deficit reduction also contains significant spending on new programs;

Third, veterans would be required to sacrifice under the President's tax and non-veterans user fee increases just like the public at large while not sharing in the proposed spending increases;

Fourth, the total amount of the proposed VA cuts represents a sacrifice of substantial funding which could have been used for eligibility reform of VA health care or other urgently needed health care delivery improvements;

Fifth, veterans won the cold war and gave us that peace dividend, and they deserve to be first in line for any spending increases, but not at the expense of the defense budget; we need to support servicemembers on the front line as well as shorten the lines of veterans waiting for benefits and health care.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has mandated veterans' programs on behalf of a grateful Nation. These earned veterans' services and benefits should be the highest domestic priority. To their credit, veterans have for years stated their willingness to do their part in reducing the deficit, but the proposed cuts ask veterans to sacrifice far more than their fair share.

Veterans' advocates in Congress have their work cut out for them. The result in this body is nearly certain. But the other body likely will have some differences which must be worked out in conference. It is absolutely essential that by then Members clearly understand the disaster this budget proposal would be for veterans' benefits and services, particularly health care.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant support of the Budget Committee substitute.

I fully support the comprehensive deficit reduction proposal President Clinton made to us last month. Though I had some misgivings about elements of the Clinton plan, particularly the proposed energy tax, I believe our President did a fair and honest job of trying to balance the need to bring down the enormous budget deficit he inherited from George Bush and Ronald Reagan with the need to significantly expand our response to the equally deadly human deficits we face in educational and training opportunities and access to health, housing, and social services. I applaud

President Clinton for his progressive vision and his commitment to putting people first and I was prepared to fully support the enactment of his entire economic plan into law.

For that reason, I am angry and disappointed that a majority of the Democrats on the Budget Committee refused to support our President's plan and have instead given us a budget which mangles the domestic priorities President Clinton outlined to the Nation last month. The careful balance the President strived to achieve between bringing down the budget deficit and making the additional investments we need to improve our economic competitiveness and address unmet social needs has been destroyed. I fully agree that it is possible and desirable to make cuts in spending in many areas of the budget beyond those called for by the President. There are countless bloated, sacred cows strewn throughout the Federal budget which can and should be attacked, from the ludicrous \$6 billion star wars boondoggle to the \$30 billion we expend every year to support no less than nine fat-laden intelligence agencies to the absurd subsidies the Agriculture Department pays every year to the producers of wool and mohair. Yet the self-described deficit hawks on the Budget Committee did not target these sacred cows in their zeal for greater deficit reduction; instead, they set their sights on low-income housing, Head Start, education, and the other starving babies of the Federal budget that meet critical human needs in this Nation. Support for education, in particular, has been scraped to the bone by this budget, making it very difficult for the President to carry out the bold education and training initiatives he has sketched out. The maximum award under the Pell Grant Program for low-income college students will likely have to be reduced by \$100 to \$200 next year. The chapter 1 compensatory education and the individuals with Disabilities Education Act programs will be level funded. Some 60 programs within the Department of Education may be cut by one-third. What we face is the prospect of an education budget worse than anything sought by President George Bush.

Not content with disemboweling the President's long-term domestic initiatives and priorities, many of these same renegade Democrats are now going after his short-term economic stimulus package as well. Enough is enough. This cannot stand. Yes, we must have sensible budget deficit reduction; we cannot afford not to. But at the same time we must also now reverse the damage inflicted by 12 years of gross neglect of human needs; we cannot afford not to do that as well. If the President's economic stimulus and investment initiative does not survive or is gutted by either the House or the Senate, I cannot in good conscience support the Budget Committee's dramatic revision of the President's budget priorities. My constituents and men and women throughout America voted for Bill Clinton because they agreed with him that at long last it was time to put people first in the Nation's Capital again. Attacks on the President's effort to fulfill that commitment must cease.

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 64.

The House Budget Committee and Chairman SABO should be commended for drafting

a resolution which sets forth a real plan to significantly reduce the Federal deficit over the next 5 years.

This is vital to long term economic recovery and growth.

Further, the budget resolution makes a commitment to carefully invest scarce public resources in our infrastructure and our people.

These investments will maximize the ability of U.S. companies—large and small—to compete in the global economy, thus creating good and lasting jobs for our citizens.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Your support will send a powerful and welcome signal to our constituents that we heard the message last November. The gridlock is gone and this Congress and this President are working together to reduce the deficit while investing in America's future.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the budget resolution.

Though I appreciate the efforts of President Clinton and the Budget Committee to tackle our budget crisis, we must go farther and do it in a way which does not jeopardize our national safety or unfairly burden our hard-working middle class.

We must go farther because, despite the deficit reduction contained in the budget resolution, the national debt would still increase by \$1.2 trillion over the next 5 years. Stop and think about that for a moment; \$1.2 trillion in deficits would be a new 5-year record in our country's history.

Add to that dubious distinction the fact that the budget resolution only looks good when we look 4 or 5 years down the road. Hiding around the corner are awesome deficits. The upward spiral begins again in 1998 and will reach the \$400 billion mark in the first years of the next century. This plan does not adequately address that longer term picture.

It's true the deficit would be even higher without this program, but that argument approaches the issue from the wrong perspective. Just because we make a terrible situation a little more tolerable doesn't mean we have solved the problem. We haven't even come close.

Of course it's also true that it's not the fault of our new President that the budget crisis is so severe. Twelve years of Reaganomics gave him a clean-up job that few people would want. But even though he didn't create the problem, it's now his problem to fix. As the President's booklet, "A Vision of Change in America," explains so well, our long-term economic strength depends on it.

To move to my specific reservations about the plan, Mr. Chairman, let me first address the issue of tax increases versus spending cuts. I have always believed that serious deficit reduction requires a fair balance between these areas. To say, as some do, that we could balance the budget without any tax increases may be good politics, but it is pie-in-the-sky budget planning. I have looked over many of those plans and there is always a glaring lack of specifics when it comes to the half trillion dollars in spending cuts they would require. Again, that may be good politics, but it is fantasy budgeting.

The problem with the budget resolution is that it is unbalanced in the opposite direction.

The budget resolution achieves its deficit reduction almost entirely through tax increases. When you factor in \$145 billion of planned new spending and some very creative accounting, the ratio is nearly \$2 of tax increases for every \$1 of spending cuts. I don't oppose the bulk of the tax increases which are concentrated on the wealthy, but we need to beef up the spending cuts in order to whittle down the \$1.2 trillion deficits.

The President made a very fair request for specific recommendations of additional cuts. For help in this area, as well as on the tax side, I turned to the people of the Third Congressional District of Illinois. I have always believed myself to be a representative of their views, so I sought their advice firsthand through townhall meetings and a budget worksheet I supplied them. I would like to share the results of their decisions with you.

For the 10 percent surtax on taxable income above \$250,000, 3,374 were in favor, 1,129 were opposed, and 369 were undecided.

For increasing the top individual tax rate from 31 percent to 36 percent, 2,790 were in favor, 1,651 were opposed, and 423 were undecided.

For increasing the top corporate tax rate from 34 percent to 36 percent, 2,365 were in favor, 1,888 were opposed and 586 were undecided.

For increasing the taxable amount of Social Security benefits to 85 percent for individual incomes above \$25,000 per year or couples over \$32,000 per year, 937 were in favor, 3,672 were opposed and 307 were undecided.

For the Btu energy tax, 638 were in favor, 3,990 were opposed and 207 were undecided.

The top five additional spending cuts recommended by my constituents were eliminating the space station, eliminating the superconducting super collider, eliminating funding for the arts and humanities, closing or converting inefficient or underused facilities in veterans hospitals and reducing military reserve personnel by 16 percent to 920,000.

My constituents also strongly support an increase in the Federal cigarette tax by 24 cents per package and raising the alcohol tax by 50 cents per bottle of wine, spirits or six pack of beer.

The easiest additions we could make to the cuts recommended by my constituents would be in planned new spending. Not spending what we plan to is easier than cutting existing funding. All it takes is a swipe of the pen. The budget resolution includes \$145 billion in new spending on what the President calls worthwhile investments. I have no doubt these investments are all worthwhile on their own merits. But it is unrealistic to plan a new spending package of this size while we're facing \$1.2 trillion in new debt. We simply can't afford it. We need to go through this package program by program to determine what is essential investment and what we can postpone.

Another issue of concern for me, Mr. Chairman, is spending cuts I believe we perhaps cannot afford to make. These are cases of being "penny wise but pound-foolish," where the long-term cost of the cuts will be greater than the immediate savings. Several areas come immediately to mind.

First, the budget resolution calls for \$110 billion in defense cuts above and beyond the

Bush administration's planned reductions. In light of the situation in Yugoslavia, the Middle East, and the possible "rebolshevikation" of Russia, cuts of this size are probably premature. We need to revisit this issue so that we do not jeopardize our national security.

Another important safety cut is the possible layoffs of air traffic controllers. The President's goal of cutting 100,000 jobs out of the Federal bureaucracy would proportionally require as many as 2,000 layoffs of air traffic controllers. As a member of the Aviation Subcommittee, I know first hand that aviation safety would be compromised by such layoffs. Safety should always be our top priority.

Other cuts of concern and reductions of Small Business Administration loans, prison construction, drug control staff, Medicare outpatient services and the strategic petroleum reserve. All of these are issues of national security or pressing social concerns like crime and health care. My constituents put these kind of cuts, especially crime-related cuts, at the very bottom of their lists.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I turn to the aspects of the budget resolution that most immediately impact the people I represent in the Third Congressional District of Illinois. After a decade of shrinking incomes, growing taxes, and decreasing services, the program asks our Nation's struggling middle class to shoulder even more burdens. I believe we should ask them last, not first.

Specifically, I am disappointed the plan resorts to yet more taxes on the middle class through the new Btu tax on energy. This tax will hit middle-class Americans wherever they turn: at the gas pump, on their electric and gas bills, and through the higher cost of many consumer products. The total tax for the average household will be anywhere from \$118 to \$460 per year depending on whose estimates you believe. Through any tax on middle class is too much, I would at least hope to see some agreement on the numbers before Congress proceeds. It's too important to go in blindly.

I also have serious concerns about the impact of higher Social Security taxes on our senior citizens. For seniors with incomes above \$25,000 individually or \$32,000 for couples, the President's plan increases the taxable portion of social security benefits from 50 percent to 85 percent. I do not know anyone who thinks that \$25,000 or \$32,000 is not middle class. Yet the President's plan asks the most from these middle-class Americans by raising their tax bills several hundred dollars per year in addition to the energy taxes.

Because a significant number of my constituents rely on mass transit to meet their transportation needs, I am also disappointed the program short changes mass transit. Over the last 5 years the plan will provide billions of dollars less than was authorized for those years in 1991 under a President who was considered hostile to mass transit. I also oppose the administration's proposal to provide new gas tax revenues entirely to highway programs, which would change a longstanding policy of providing 20 percent of those revenues to mass transit.

These transportation proposals overlook the fact that mass transit programs contribute to the economic development of our metropolitan

areas by creating jobs and relieving traffic congestion. It is shortsighted to ignore our transit needs and deny our cities and counties the benefits they gain from transit programs.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, the people of the Third Congressional District of Illinois understand the deficit problem and want deficit reduction. But they want a serious and balanced plan which achieves long-term fiscal responsibility without unfairly burdening the middle class. As we finalize our economic program during the next several months, I will continue to consult with my constituents on the merits of the program and any proposed revisions. But at present I must vote "no".

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the resolution we are currently considering.

During the last election the American people made it clear that they want action from their Nation's leadership to solve a number of significant problems facing the United States. They also made it clear that our current economic quagmire is unacceptable.

By passing this blueprint for the budget for the next fiscal year we are letting the American public know that the Congress is also concerned about our national debt and that it is willing to take aggressive actions to try to resolve our problems, even if these actions are occasionally unpopular.

It is clear that something must be done to control the Federal deficit. Our national debt is now five times what it was in 1980. Left unchecked, the annual Federal deficit will hit \$638 billion by the year 2003. The practical impact would be that living standards, which once doubled every 25 years in this Nation, would take nearly 100 years to double. This is unacceptable.

As many people are quick to point out, the resolution before us includes both spending cuts and tax increases to reduce the deficit. When reviewing the President's proposal, my primary concern is that any increase in taxes be apportioned in an equitable and rational manner. I am convinced that the package we are about to vote on meets the criteria.

The wealthy minority of the Nation, who for years have benefited from trickle down economics, must be required to pay their fair share. Furthermore, we must not put any more strain on families and individuals who are currently just making ends meet. These people, the working and middle classes and the senior citizens, are the backbone of our Nation.

Like most people who have taken the time to carefully review the President's proposal, there are items I disagree with. Nonetheless the overall package places a minority of the burden on the people and the corporations which are in the best position to make concessions.

Furthermore, I strongly support the portion of President Clinton's plan which calls for substantial spending cuts to help bring Federal spending back into line. I will join the President in reviewing every Federal program and making cuts wherever possible, and I would like to take this opportunity to urge the President and my colleagues to take an especially hard look at the increasing trend of academic and corporate welfare.

In addition to the specific cuts that the President has recommended I am committed

to remaining an outspoken critic of Government programs that do not benefit the American public, that have a negligible return on their investments, or that are better suited for the private sector.

In my testimony to the House Budget Committee last week, I recommended to the President and my colleagues in the Congress more than \$200 billion worth of additional cuts in spending that can be made over the next 5 years. These specific cuts were also detailed in the March 10 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It would be foolish for the President or Congress to ask Americans to make any sacrifices if we are not doing all we can to see that abuse, mismanagement, and unnecessary spending are eradicated.

Those of us who live in America have been the beneficiaries of nearly 200 years of responsible economic policies. However, for the last decade successive Presidents have used their veto power to pursue and impose an irresponsible course of fiscal policies that will deny future generations of Americans the quality of life and expectations that we have enjoyed. This should be unacceptable to all of us.

As a Member of Congress for the last 7 years I have been unduly frustrated by the inability of the leadership of this Nation to take seriously the threat posed by our overwhelming deficit. The U.S. deficit, if left unchecked, could very easily be the downfall of this Nation, and mere lip service will not make it go away. Fortunately, President Clinton has taken a leadership role in redirecting our ship of state. It is now incumbent for the Congress and the American people to support this difficult effort.

Mr. Chairman, colleagues, no solution will be easy, nor will any solution be immediate. Doing nothing, however, would be a crime against the future.

For this reason, I support the resolution currently before us and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I want to address for a moment the defense portion of the budget resolution.

I believe we can live with the figure for defense for fiscal year 1994 that is embodied in this resolution but it will not be easy, especially if additional budget factors come into play which I will discuss later.

By 1997, it is projected that we will have 1.4 million men and women in uniform, the lowest number since before Pearl Harbor.

By 1997, there will be 12 years of decline in defense except for the one-time spike for Desert Storm.

In a few years defense spending will be the lowest percent of GNP since before World War II.

Within a few years, over 600 overseas bases will be shut down, scaled back, or placed on standby.

We also have had, of course, a significant reduction in domestic bases.

NEW POLICY REQUIRED

Now we all recognize that because of the collapse of the former Soviet Union, significant decreases in defense spending have been warranted.

However, I'd like to make two observations on that issue:

First, as I've already pointed out, dramatic reductions have been made and are projected to be made in the future.

Second, the simple fact is that the new world order is: not orderly; and not very new. As the former head of the Central Intelligence Agency recently stated: "With the breakdown of communism, age old ethnics, religious, political and regional conflicts have reemerged with a vengeance".

So we live in a very destabilized and volatile global geopolitical situation, and as the world's only superpower we need a robust military capability on that global stage.

North Korea continues to develop nuclear weapons.

Iran continues a vigorous military buildup.

Saddam Hussein is still around.

An unstable Russia currently has tens of thousands of nuclear warheads.

There is a potential of a spreading conflict in the Balkans.

We must develop a defense budget based on a new national security policy as opposed to budgetary numbers driving our decisions.

PERSONNEL ARE KEY

It is difficult to make a precise determination as to what level of force structure and defense spending is needed to deal with the world geopolitical situation.

But there is one constant in this debate that we know we need: well-trained, highly motivated, professional men and women serving in the Armed Forces.

We had that force in Desert Storm.

We have that force today.

However, I have observed long-lead indicators that show we may have quality problems in the future.

First, a poll which gauges the intention of young people to enlist the armed services has been on a downward curve.

Second, recently, the number of high school graduates entering the service is declining. It had been almost 100 percent and now its in the low 90 percent for most of the services.

Third, frequent deployments must be draining morale; one Marine unit I inspected in Somalia had been deployed abroad three straight Christmases.

We must be very careful over the next few years to ensure that a hollow force does not reemerge.

As I look at the defense budget I see some real funding problems we face:

We may very well want to restore the pay cut to at least some of the military.

Anticipated management savings may not materialize.

Inflation estimates may be too low.

If the Btu tax applies to the DOD, DOD will have an additional major bill to pay.

Economic conversion will be expensive.

Cleanup of nuclear and chemical weapon sites and conventional environmental cleanup will be very costly.

The price tag for all these are expanding at the very time the budget is declining.

If significant declines in defense continue in the outyears, we may very well have to decide between quality people versus expensive new hardware programs.

If it comes to that, I will be for retaining the quality force and reluctantly have to oppose various high-dollar hardware programs.

We need to maintain a quality force at all costs.

If a new national security policy is not developed and we abide by the current national security commitments, the outyear budget levels are too low.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, the Full Employment Act of 1946, as subsequently amended by Humphrey-Hawkins, sets out specific numerical goals for economic policy. As amended, there are three goals:

First, 4 percent unemployment;

Second, 3 percent inflation; and

Third, a 20 percent of gross national product [GNP] cap on Federal spending.

These have been official congressional policy since 1979. But, of course, Congress doesn't meet these goals, particularly the 20 percent of GNP spending limit.

The budget resolution before us today would set spending levels for fiscal year 1994 at about 25 percent of GNP, far above Congress' official established policy.

Like so many other attempts to constrain spending and balance the budget, Congress has simply ignored Humphrey-Hawkins' statutory spending limit goal, and that is why I believe a constitutional spending limit is needed.

With that in mind, I've introduced the balanced budget/spending limitation amendment, which would do three things: require a balanced Federal budget; establish a Federal spending limit, at 19 percent of GNP—a more accurate historical average than Humphrey-Hawkins' 20-percent limit—and, in order to help enforce the foregoing requirements, provide the President with line-item veto authority.

The balanced budget/spending limitation amendment is based upon two fundamental premises: First, the Federal Government must begin to live within its means; second, how the Government lives within its means is as important as the mere fact that it does live within its means.

When the American people say they want a balanced budget, they mean less Government spending, not an increase in their already heavy tax burden. Many of our offices have been flooded in recent weeks with calls, letters, and postcards demanding that Congress cut spending first.

The balanced budget/spending limitation amendment would protect against tax increases—particularly the magnitude of tax increases proposed by the President—by limiting spending to 19 percent of GNP, the average level of revenue the Government has been collecting for the last 25 years.

By tying Federal spending to GNP, the Kyl amendment also gives Congress the incentive to enact pro-growth economic policies. The more the economy grows, the more Congress can spend.

The need for a Federal spending limit is evidenced in two reports, one released by the General Accounting Office [GAO] last June. The GAO projected that, based on current trends, Federal spending could grow to 42.4 percent of GNP by the year 2020, from about 25 percent today, with a real per capita GNP in the year 2020 unchanged from the current level of \$24,000 a year. In other words, if Federal spending isn't limited, there will be no improved standard of living for the next generation.

A report released in 1991 by Stephen Moore of the Institute for Policy Innovation came to similar conclusions about the proportion of GNP the Government will command if current trends are followed. The report concluded that:

Meaningful, constitutional limits on the growth of Federal spending are needed to bring the size of government down to economically sustainable levels. One way to achieve this end would be to limit the percentage of GNP which the government can command from the private economy.

Moreover, according to Dr. James M. Buchanan, the 1986 Nobel laureate in economic sciences:

Reducing government as a share of GNP from its current level of 25 percent to, say, 20 percent would generate roughly a two percent increase in the rate of growth in GNP. And back-of-the-envelope arithmetic suggests that by the early 2000s, and forever beyond, the real value of the programs financed by government would be larger than they would be under the regime that keeps government's share at 25 percent.

This is precisely what the Kyl amendment will do.

Mr. Chairman, the idea of a Federal spending limit is not new. It is set in law in Humphrey-Hawkins, under which we are debating today.

If this House is serious about deficit reduction, and about meeting the statutory goals it has set for itself, it should reject the budget resolution reported by the Budget Committee, pass the alternative Kasich budget, and then take up the balanced budget/spending limitation amendment.

Let's heed the people's call to cut spending first.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, the House will soon vote on the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994—House Concurrent Resolution 64. This congressional budget blueprint keeps the implementation schedule of the President's economic program on track, and is almost a month early in terms of the April 15 statutory deadline. We are serious about long-term investment, reduced Federal spending, and deficit reduction, and this plan shows it.

The budget resolution incorporates the long-term investment strategies put forth by President Clinton. It designates true budget priorities, recommending not only how much to fund, but where to fund it. The President targets scarce resources where they are best used—in human capital and physical capital—which comprise the job-creating, growth-producing sector of the economy.

The long-term investment priorities include education, infrastructure, retraining for displaced workers, Head Start, child immunizations against disease, health care research, development of civilian technologies, and community economic development.

The budget resolution also accommodates the President's proposed tax incentives for economic growth, which include incentives for investment in equipment and factory modernization, small business venture capital stock, low-income housing and mortgage revenue bonds, and expansion of the work-based earned income tax credit.

House Concurrent Resolution 64 follows through on the President's goals for deficit re-

duction, recommending some \$510 billion in reduced deficits over 5 years. It would halve the deficit as a percentage of gross domestic product, and more than meet the President's 1997 goal for deficit reduction.

We have unequivocally responded to our constituents, who have called for higher levels of reduced spending. The resolution makes an additional \$63 billion in spending cuts, and \$11 billion in reduced interest payments.

The spending cuts are tough, and they are real. There will be \$90 billion in entitlement savings, including \$48.3 billion in reduced Medicare payments to providers. However, Medicare recipients are not hit with higher out-of-pocket expenses. Defense spending is further reduced, and annual discretionary spending is cut back below 1993 levels and then frozen at those levels for 5 years. These are true austerity measures on the part of the Federal Government.

This belt-tightening may not be pleasant for those affected, but the resulting overall economic improvement, such as continued reduction in long-term interest rates, is healthy for both consumers and business investment. A healthy economy will provide more opportunities for high wage jobs and growing incomes. That is what we are working toward with this plan.

Mr. Chairman, the budget resolution incorporates President Clinton's economic plan for investment, deficit reduction and budget priorities. The plan provides the bricks and mortar needed for an improved job market and higher standard of living. With our support for this legislation, we can use these materials to construct a solid economic structure.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering a budget resolution that mandates the most significant reduction in the budget deficit since I have been in Congress.

This budget reduces the deficit by \$510 billion over the next 5 years and cuts spending \$63 billion more than the President has proposed.

The economic effect is to cut the deficit as a percent of gross domestic product in half: from 4.9 percent in 1993 to 2.5 percent in 1998. This yields more savings and speeds private sector capital formation resulting in greater economic growth.

The economic assumptions used are conservative; as reported in the Wall Street Journal on Tuesday, many economists think we will, in fact, achieve greater deficit reduction and growth than this budget assumes.

This budget freezes discretionary spending below the 1993 level for the next 5 years and ensures that the 1997 deficit will be \$144 billion less than under current spending.

Clearly, more difficult decisions lie ahead of us in the battle to balance the budget.

I hope that we can uncover additional spending cuts in the future and that we enact both a balanced budget amendment and an enhanced rescission process to bring the deficit to zero. But today's resolution moves us closer to a balanced budget than we have been at any time in the past decade.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill. We were elected by people who realize the days of reckless Federal spending must end. They expect us to come

here and establish fiscal priorities and make difficult funding decisions between worthy programs.

The bill before us today does none of that. Instead it says; "call the mint and tell them to print up some new money, the Democrats have a new spending bill."

I agree with a number of the goals of this bill. We should give more money to the WIC Program, we should give more money to community development block grant assistance and we should fully fund the 1991 highway bill.

But that funding should come from establishing priorities, making tough choices and cutting other programs. That's governing, that's political courage. Adding to the deficit, as this bill does, is an act of political cowardice. And worse, it's a blatant attempt by President Clinton to attach his name to an economic recovery in which he played no part.

We have been told that this \$16 billion emergency bill is both an economic stimulus package and a long-term investment in our people. I wonder how the American people are going to score some of the spending the Democrats have slipped into this bill. How do you think they will score the millions spent in this bill for migratory bird management and fisheries? Does that stimulate the economy or is that an investment in people? How about the millions spent over at the National Science Foundation to give bureaucrats raises? How many jobs will that create?

And no irresponsible spending bill would be complete without the District of Columbia. The District gets \$28 million. The Democrats might call that investment or stimulus but in Iowa we call that another bailout of the Nation's most inefficient and bloated local government.

Every effort in committee to make this spending package more responsible or at least accountable was soundly rejected. I personally offered amendments at subcommittee to put this spending on budget, so we don't just borrow more and further exacerbate the deficit.

This bill proposes to stimulate an economy already on the move at a cost of \$52,000 per job created. At that rate it won't be very long before the Democrats push us back into recession. But this time they will have no one to blame but themselves.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of our President and in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 64, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994. President Clinton told the American people last fall, that if he was entrusted with the responsibilities of executive governance, he would bring change—change from the human disregard of the past decade. He has already delivered on that promise because, like Martin Luther King, he believes that "what self-centered men have torn down, other centered men can build up."

The President and the Democrats in Congress have presented an economic package that will accomplish what no Republican even attempted in 12 years. We have before us an investment package that carefully balances the needs and ambitions of our country—for jobs, housing, education, and economic development—with the daunting reality of an out of

control budget deficit. The budget package accomplishes this delicate balance by fairly placing the greatest burden on those that reaped the greatest returns in the hit-and-run 1980's.

Today, for the first time in more than a decade, the executive and legislative branches of Government come together to outline the future of this country. That future is paved by a plan that commits \$2 out of every \$3 saved from spending cuts and revenue increase for deficit reduction, while \$1 out of every \$3 saved is used for new investment. As a result, the budget achieves substantial deficit reduction while also making sizable new investments to improve long-term growth and address unmet needs.

I must state for the record that I would have preferred a package that went further in addressing the needs of our devastated communities, a package that would have contained more social investment. I was particularly concerned when \$63 billion in cuts were added to the President's initial plan. These are real cuts in significant areas, some of which hurt. That is why I believe that the economic stimulus package cannot be trimmed, cannot be altered. We must hold the line on this cutting frenzy. That is also why I supported the alternative budget package offered by the Congressional Black Caucus and the congressional progressive caucus which mirrored the President's package in many ways but added to it in some areas. This alternative plan achieved added investments for social programs through increasing the top corporate tax rate from 36 to 38 percent and raising the top rate on capital gains income from 28 to 31 percent. The alternative budget also eliminated the two regressive provisions of the Democratic tax package—the energy tax and the increase in taxes on higher income Social Security recipients. But, unfortunately, I realize that we do not have the votes to make these changes to the budget, so I believe strongly that the Democratic budget is the best plan we can pass through the Congress.

To understand fully the need for social investment and economic parity in this country, we need to understand fully the present condition of this country and how we got here. We must realize that the disastrous economic decisions of the Reagan and Bush years have choked us with a long running economic recession, which has particularly affected low wage laborers and people of color, and damaged the prospects for long-term economic growth in this country.

The senseless military buildup of the last decade has been rendered useless by the spread of democracy and the end of the cold war. Money was stripped from housing and other social programs to fuel the missiles and tanks that now sit there and await the arrival of a military enemy, while the enemies of poverty, hopelessness, sickness, and inequality devour our human potential. As Bill Clinton and AL GORE articulated in their campaign literature, "during the 1980's, our Government betrayed the values that made America great: providing opportunity, taking responsibility, rewarding work."

As census data shows, there were 35.7 million poor Americans in 1991, numbers which had not been seen in this country since before the great society programs of the 1960's. It is

important to note that this statistic is based on the Government standard of poverty which lists the average poverty threshold for a family of four at under \$14,000, which comes to approximately \$67 per week to house, feed and clothe each person in that family—an inconceivable standard that requires careful review and revision.

This increase in poverty was particularly sharp among our youngest Americans, with now over 14 million children officially classified as poor. Like the overall number of poor people, this number of poor children is greater than at any time in the last two decades. Certainly, the recession has contributed harshly to these numbers but it is not the sole culprit. Even before the recession we saw many working class families less able to put their hands on the ladder of mobility, let alone attempt a climb. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities in Washington, the principal determinants of these statistics have been declining wages and a weakening of the safety net.

A 1992 census report illustrated that the proportion of full-time year round workers who are paid wages too low to lift a family of four out of poverty has grown sharply in recent years. In 1979, some 12.1 percent of workers were paid wages this low. By 1990, that figure grew to 18 percent. The census data also reveals a long-term increase in poverty rates among working families. The poverty rate for families with children in which the family head works climbed nearly one-fourth between 1980 and 1991.

But the declines in income have not been across the board. Changes to the U.S. Tax Code during the early 1980's robbed Pedro to pay Paul. Average working families paid \$5.8 billion more in taxes between 1977 and 1992, while those families earning incomes over \$168,000 received a \$83.7 billion windfall. This redistribution of income is most starkly portrayed by the statistic that in 1983, the wealthiest 1 percent of the population controlled 31.3 percent of the wealth but by 1989, they controlled 37.1 percent of the wealth. To understand the impact of these numbers think of dividing \$100 among 100 people. One person would get \$37 and the other 99 people would each receive 68 cents. That is the state of income distribution in this country.

The poisons of racism and sexism have further aggravated wage disparities. While white male weekly incomes average \$509, those of black and Hispanics average \$374 and \$328 respectively. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics also informs us that these same weekly wages were \$374 for white women, \$323 for black women, and \$293 for Hispanic women, making us the lowest paid of all groups.

A second factor pushing poverty rates up over the past decade has been declines in Government assistance programs, especially those for the poor and the unemployed. Many of these Government cuts were directed where we could least afford them, our cities: General revenue sharing was eliminated, urban development action grants were eliminated, community development block grants were reduced by over \$15 billion, assisted housing money was cut by over 68 percent and urban mass transit funding was cut by close to \$8 billion.

These long-term trends have forcefully intensified the polarization of our society into those that have too much and those that have no chance. In my home state of New York, the 1980's saw a 10-percent decline in the incomes of the poorest fifth of families but an astounding 20-percent increase in the incomes of the richest fifth of families. I believe that this is not what the founding fathers—and mothers—of our nascent Government had in mind when they assembled "to form a more perfect union" and "promote the general welfare" of its citizens.

So it should come as no surprise that our country wanted change. There was a desire by the electorate for representation that was more in touch with them, the desire to vote for someone who had a genuine understanding of the every day hardships faced by American voters, the desire to vote for someone who would fight for their interests, and the desire to vote for someone who would make their lives more secure. So, this country elected a Democrat, Bill Clinton, to represent them in Washington.

We must now translate the political empowerment illustrated by this election, into economic empowerment for all Americans. We must have the vision to advance those initiatives that will help people contribute to the system in the long run, rather than drain from the system. The budget initiatives before us, some directly—others indirectly, will enable our people to produce for themselves.

The budget resolution assumes the major Clinton initiatives that put people first, protect our children and assist the most vulnerable in our society. The budget provides full funding for Head Start. By 1999, this essential proposal will help 1.4 million eligible, disadvantaged children get ready for school, stay healthy with immunizations and health check-ups, and receive nutritious meals.

By providing full funding of the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for women, infants and children [WIC] by 1996, the budget proposal will add 1.9 million pregnant women, infants, and children to this vital program which addresses infant mortality.

To reduce hunger in America, the budget package increases food stamps by \$7 billion over the next 5 years. The measure also makes a commitment to our youth by providing 2 million jobs in summer youth employment and training for economically disadvantaged youth aged 14 to 21 as well as funding to repair and maintain Job Corps centers and to begin building new ones.

The package also includes a substantial expansion in the earned income tax credit assistance for very low-income people. The credit would allow a minimum wage worker to at least bring his or her family up to the poverty line. The credit is tied to earnings so it rewards work.

To shelter our people and develop our neighborhoods, the budget package makes a substantial commitment to housing and community development. The package mirrors the President's proposal to increase rental assistance from 40,000 units to 100,000 units by 1998.

Although a comprehensive health care reform proposal will be presented to the Congress by the administration in the spring, the

President and the Democrats in Congress did not ignore this issue in the budget proposal. The resolution includes full funding for Ryan White AIDS programs major increases for childhood immunizations, substantial increases in biomedical research for women's health and increases for more health clinics in low-income urban neighborhoods.

Mr. Chairman, this is a budget package that invests in our future and our people. I urge my colleagues to support this budget and then heed the call of Pericles to "wait for that wisest of counselors—time," for time will prove this package to be right for America.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, these last couple of weeks, I have been wading through the letters and listening to the flood of phone calls from my neighbors back home. They are worried about how the economic proposals are going to affect their pocketbooks.

My home State of New Jersey has not bounced back from the recession. It currently ranks 46th in job creation among the 50 States and February's unemployment rate was up from last month at an outrageous 7.8 percent. Our economy needs an extra kick in the pants and the stimulus package is just the boost we are looking for. It promises jobs and it will lay the groundwork for a stable and expanding economy in the future.

The stimulus package would provide \$16.3 billion in supplemental appropriations requested by President Bill Clinton for investment in infrastructure; jobs and human resources; community development; and energy, environment, and technology programs. Included in the measure is \$4 billion in mandatory spending to cover this year's costs of the recent extension in emergency unemployment benefits and \$3 billion from the highway trust fund for road construction and maintenance.

I'm reluctantly voting for the budget resolution. But the fact remains that we need a vehicle to move the process of deficit reduction and economic growth forward. Even though this makes real and significant cuts in the budget deficit; this resolution will reduce the deficit by \$510 billion in 5 years. Yet, I still feel that additional cuts are needed and can be found.

I am pleased that the House Budget Committee cut spending by an additional \$63 billion and that the Senate is proposing even greater spending cuts. Even I, as a freshman in my first 2 months in office, was personally responsible for saving the Federal Government \$70 million in one program. I plan to continue my search for spending cuts whenever and wherever I can find them.

The budget resolution consolidates President Clinton's 5-year economic plan and the \$63 billion in spending cuts made by the House Budget Committee. It calls for deficit reduction and investments in programs to generate economic growth over the next 5 years.

The vote on the budget resolution was extremely difficult for me because I am not satisfied with the total package but we have to put a ceiling on the spending we do around here. Even though it is not perfect, it was the best plan offered to achieve my goals of job creation and long-term economic growth. The whole is greater than the sum of its parts. The resolution reported by the Budget Committee significantly reduces the deficit, invests in

America's future, and makes the structural changes that are desperately needed for a healthy, stable, and growing economy.

The real cuts in spending will come out of the Appropriations Committee and the real revenue provisions will come out of the Ways and Means Committee. If I am not satisfied with the results of these committees when they are presented, I simply will not vote for them. But something must be done. For now, the President deserves a change to have his plan move forward.

It is not set in stone. This is only a blueprint. If the spending cuts do not materialize and Congress does not make significant attempts to find additional cuts, then I reserve the right not to support it.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 64, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994.

Do I believe that this budget is perfect? No. Perfection is not an art we have mastered in Washington, DC.

I, for one, have long been an opponent of several of the cuts being proposed in this package. I am opposed to cuts in the cost of living adjustments to Federal retirees. I am opposed to cuts in Medicare reimbursement to hospitals and doctors in the absence of national health care reform. I am opposed to raising the percentage of Social Security benefits subject to the income tax.

For every single provision of this budget, I am confident we could find some group of Members in opposition.

But Mr. Chairman, the time has come to finally move forward on our budget crisis and I will not take part in derailing that effort. The future economic and social health of our Nation is at stake in this debate. If we allow ourselves to pick this budget apart piece by piece, it will collapse. This Nation cannot afford for that to happen.

This budget will make a frontal assault on our deficit crisis by producing \$510 billion in real deficit reduction over the next 5 years.

It will be long last move America toward the kind of economy we must have in the post-cold-war world by using Federal investment to build a solid base for civilian high-technology industries.

It recognizes that meeting our commitment to infrastructure investment is crucial to stimulate the private sector growth which will create good jobs for our people.

It recognizes that our most precious resources—the American people—have too long been overlooked. By increasing investment in the Head Start Program, in worker retraining, in health care research and treatment, and in the economic viability of our cities, it finally reverses 12 years of neglect.

There is an old saying, Mr. Chairman, that what wears down a traveler is not the mountain in the distance—it is the grain of sand in his shoe. Will the first steps along this road to economic security be painful? Absolutely. But for the good of the Nation, we cannot afford to let that pain stop us from beginning the journey.

We have the opportunity today to place this country firmly on the path to economic prosperity and a brighter future for our children. We cannot let that chance pass us by.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the resolution.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 64, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994, and H.R. 1335 the stimulus and investment supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1993.

On February 17, 1993, President Clinton unveiled his economic and deficit reduction package and gave this country new direction and new hope for the future.

House Concurrent Resolution 64, and H.R. 1335, together largely embody President Clinton's bold economic proposals. I strongly support these measures, which will reverse the trends of the last 12 years that have created huge deficits and economic decline, and will put us on the path to long-term economic growth.

Under the Reagan and Bush administrations, most Americans experienced a decline in their real wages; their families increasingly had to rely on two-earner couples; they saw the gap between the rich and poor widen; they witnessed growing poverty and homelessness; and they felt the threat of a ballooning Federal deficit impeding economic recovery. Mr. Chairman, the American people have asked for change.

The budget resolution and supplemental appropriations, as a reflection of President Clinton's plan, offer major changes in economic policy necessary to create jobs, reinvigorate the economy, cut the Federal deficit and restore a measure of fairness to the system.

In a recovery that still lacks job growth, the plan will generate more and better jobs for millions of Americans who are out of work. The plan calls for increased funding for jobs programs and job training, mass transit, highway construction, research and development, defense conversion and a variety of other investment programs that will create an estimated 8 million jobs over the next 4 years.

The plan also increases investment in human capital by providing funding for programs such as Head Start, child immunization, education and training initiatives. Creating a more healthy and productive work force is a true investment in our future.

The plan also provides much needed funding for housing and community development to help rebuild and revitalize our cities.

The budget resolution includes a credible deficit-reduction plan, in which the Federal deficit will be reduced by \$510 billion over the next 5 years. The resolution adds an additional \$62 billion in discretionary spending cuts to the President's proposal. More than half of the deficit reduction plan is to be achieved through spending cuts. The remaining deficit reduction will come from revenue increases.

The budget resolution restores a measure of fairness to the system. The resolution calls for the revenue proposals included in the President's package. The wealthiest few who paid less taxes on higher incomes in the 1980's will be asked to pay their fair share. Those making over \$100,000 a year, will pay 70 percent of the new taxes.

With the increased earned income tax credit and increased funding for food stamps, also recommended by the President, people making under \$30,000 will pay virtually no increase in taxes and those making less than \$10,000 will actually pay fewer taxes.

Mr. Chairman, we may not like all of the items in the President's package, however, it represents a break from the failed policies of the past and a step in the right direction. I urge all of my colleagues to support the President and vote for House Concurrent Resolution 64 and H.R. 1335.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, today we take a definitive step toward long-term deficit reduction. Long an issue of tremendous concern to Tennessee's Third Congressional District and myself, the national debt has paralyzed our efforts toward steady job growth and economic stability. Taming the national debt will free up critical resources needed for programs that have real promise and provide hope to the men, women, and children of this country.

The budget resolution before us is by no means perfect. It is representative of a compromise between dramatic spending cuts and revenue increases. House Concurrent Resolution 64 is an outline for our spending and revenue intake over the next fiscal year. It is a starting point in the budget process that, as it stands now, will yield \$510 billion in deficit reduction over the next 5 years.

I want to applaud the Budget Committee for offering \$63 billion more in budget cuts above what the President offered. I was one of several Members who encouraged the committee and the President to find greater savings. We are on the right track. But let's not stop cutting there. Now we should look for even more areas for reductions. Let us issue a challenge to our colleagues to weigh in below the discretionary budget caps for fiscal year 1994 and take an even bigger chunk out of the deficit.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of this budget resolution is not without some pain. While it does not target specific programs or types of tax increases, it does set limits which will undoubtedly have some impact on the public. Thousands of my constituents have called for a good faith effort by Congress to reduce spending before they consider raising any type of taxes. This resolution offers just that. I have heard from many who are willing to consider a fair, but limited tax increase if the spending cuts are there. The next couple of months will afford the Members time to judge the specifics of the package to see if it meets the test of fairness and achieves our objectives.

Failure to pass the fiscal year 1994 budget resolution will show the American people that gridlock and irresponsibility continue to prevail in Congress and the executive branch. Let us move forward with the resolution, begin the budget process, and get this country back on its feet. It is time to make the tough decisions, face our problems head on and launch an all out assault on wasteful Government spending and the national debt. Vote "yes" on House Concurrent Resolution 64.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

□ 2050

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT) having assumed the chair, Mr. SERRANO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration

the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 183, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

AYES—243

Abercrombie	Fields (LA)	McDermott
Ackerman	Filner	McHale
Andrews (ME)	Fingerhut	McKinney
Andrews (TX)	Flake	McNulty
Applegate	Foglietta	Meehan
Bacchus (FL)	Ford (MI)	Meek
Baessler	Frank (MA)	Menendez
Barcia	Frost	Mfume
Barlow	Furse	Miller (CA)
Barrett (WI)	Gejdenson	Mineta
Becerra	Gephardt	Minge
Beilenson	Gibbons	Mink
Berman	Glickman	Moakley
Beverly	Gonzalez	Mollohan
Bilbray	Gordon	Montgomery
Bishop	Green	Moran
Blackwell	Gutierrez	Murphy
Bonior	Hall (OH)	Murtha
Borski	Hamburg	Nadler
Boucher	Hamilton	Natcher
Brewster	Harman	Neal (MA)
Brooks	Hastings	Neal (NC)
Browder	Hayes	Oberstar
Brown (CA)	Hefner	Obey
Brown (FL)	Hilliard	Oliver
Brown (OH)	Hinchey	Ortiz
Bryant	Hoagland	Orton
Byrne	Hochbrueckner	Owens
Cantwell	Holden	Pallone
Cardin	Hoyer	Parker
Carr	Hughes	Pastor
Chapman	Hutto	Payne (NJ)
Clay	Inslee	Payne (VA)
Clayton	Jefferson	Pelosi
Clement	Johnson (GA)	Penny
Clyburn	Johnson (SD)	Peterson (FL)
Coleman	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)
Collins (IL)	Johnston	Pickle
Collins (MI)	Kanjorski	Pomeroy
Condit	Kaptur	Poshard
Conyers	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Cooper	Kennelly	Rahall
Coppersmith	Kildee	Rangel
Costello	Klecicka	Reed
Coyne	Klein	Reynolds
Cramer	Klink	Richardson
Danner	Kopetski	Roemer
Darden	Kreidler	Rose
de la Garza	LaFalce	Rostenkowski
Deal	Lambert	Rowland
DeFazio	Lancaster	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Lantos	Rush
Dellums	LaRocco	Sabo
Derrick	Laughlin	Sanders
Deutsch	Lehman	Sangmeister
Dicks	Levin	Sarpalius
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer
Dixon	Lloyd	Schenk
Dooley	Lowey	Schroeder
Durbin	Maloney	Schumer
Edwards (CA)	Mann	Scott
Edwards (TX)	Manton	Serrano
Engel	Markey	Sharp
English (AZ)	Martinez	Shepherd
English (OK)	Matsui	Skaggs
Eshoo	Mazzoli	Skelton
Evans	McCloskey	Slattery
Fazio	McCurdy	Slaughter

Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin

Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer

Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—183

Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Archer
Army
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Billrakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Barlow
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Frank (CT)
Frank (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte

Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Long
Machtley
Manzullo
Margolies
Mezvinsky
McCardless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari

Moorhead
Morella
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Ford (TN)
Henry

NOT VOTING—4

□ 2111

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF COSPONSORS FROM H.R. 1178

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the names of

all of the cosponsors be removed from H.R. 1178.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was in a meeting and inadvertently missed rollcall vote No. 83, the motion offered by Mr. BURTON to strike the resolving clause. Since this motion would have killed House Concurrent Resolution 64, the budget resolution, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state for the RECORD that on rollcall vote number 79, I inadvertently voted "no" when I had intended to vote "yes."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material, in the RECORD on House Concurrent Resolution 64.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 1993, TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON H.R. 670, THE FAMILY PLANNING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1992

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight on the night of Tuesday, March 23, 1993, to file a privileged report with respect to H.R. 670, the Family Planning Amendments Act of 1993.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1993

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 132 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 132

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider further in the House the bill (H.R. 1335) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes. All points of order against the bill are waived. It shall be in order to consider one amendment, if offered by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The amendment shall be consid-

ered as read, shall be debatable for ten minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against the amendment are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the amendment and on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, if offered by Representative Michel of Illinois or his designee. A motion to recommit with instructions shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 132 makes in order the further consideration of H.R. 1335, the President's economic stimulus bill, in the House. The resolution waives all points of order against the bill and makes in order one indivisible amendment if offered by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The amendment will be considered as read and debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The amendment will not be subject to further amendment and all points of order against the amendment will be waived.

Finally, under the resolution the previous question will be considered as ordered on the amendment and the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, if offered by Representative MICHEL or his designee. If the motion to recommit contains instructions, the motion will be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided by the proponent and an opponent.

Mr. Speaker, in the publication entitled "A Vision of Change for America," the President outlines a plan to begin the process of restoring the American dream for us and our children.

The President's plan has three key elements: economic stimulus, to create jobs now while laying the foundation for long-term economic growth; public investments to increase the productivity of our people and our businesses; and a serious, fair, and balanced deficit-reduction plan to stop the Government from draining the private investments that generate jobs and increase incomes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1335 embodies the first element of the President's three-part plan: the economic stimulus. The bill invests in the improvement of our infrastructure by financing improvements for our highways, airports, and mass transit systems. These improve-

ments will put thousands of Americans back to work and help place our Nation on an equal footing with competitors who have already invested heavily in their infrastructures.

The bill invests in our people by providing additional resources for education and job training like summer youth employment, college loans and grants, and elementary and secondary school assistance. This will help all Americans, not just a privileged few, to acquire the skills it takes to succeed in today's competitive global environment.

The bill also invests in research and development by accelerating the development and use of science and technology through enhanced computer development and deployment, telecommunications network promotion, engineering, and scientific research. This type of investment will ensure our Nation remains a world leader in these fields.

Finally, for those who want to work but cannot find jobs, the bill provides \$4 billion to fund extended unemployment benefits to the 1.9 million individuals who have exhausted their State unemployment benefits. The President signed this legislation earlier this month.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 132 will allow the House to complete expeditiously its consideration of this important legislation to boost a weak economy, create jobs, and begin to invest in our country's future. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my voice may not be strong, but there was no way in the world that I was going to miss the opportunity to rise here in strong opposition to this rule. This gag rule is a clear reflection of a Democratic leadership that opposes open debate, that scoffs at fiscal responsibility, and that pays nothing more than lip service to the rights of the people's Representatives here in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the vote on this rule represents one of the clearest votes on fiscal responsibility that we will have this year. It presents a distinct choice upon which the American people can judge their elected representatives. The vote on this rule will separate the House of Representatives into two simple groups. On one hand, there are those who support change in Congress, responsibility for spending, and truth in government.

□ 2120

They will vote "no" on this rule; on the other hand, there are those who support business as usual, prolific spending, and want to hide responsibility from the American people—those

Members will vote "yes" on this horrible rule.

Mr. Speaker, this closed rule strips every Member of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, of their right to offer an amendment to reduce spending on an appropriations bill. Historically, the vast majority of emergency appropriations bills come to the floor under a procedure that permits Members to call a vote on particular spending items.

Those urgent supplemental appropriations bills were considered under normal procedures because the spending really was urgent. Why does the Democratic leadership require an unprecedented complete gag rule on this \$19.5 billion emergency spending bill? Because if amendments to strike spending are permitted, then the truth will come out that most of this spending has absolutely nothing to do with any emergency, will not stimulate any job creation, and is not urgent to anyone but the special interests and politicians.

The Democratic leadership, Mr. Speaker, may think they can hide the specifics of this spending bill from the American people, but they are dead wrong. The American taxpayers are taking the time to see through the smokescreen that is being put up here—and they are not about to be confused or deceived by the phoney leadership amendment that is nothing but an 11th hour attempt to cover up all the waste and pork in this bill.

The vote on this rule is a vote on important amendments to control wasteful spending. Don't just take my word on it—the National Taxpayers Union, the Citizens Against Government Waste, and the Citizens for a Sound Economy all recognize that the vote on this rule is not a procedural vote, it's a real vote for controlling runaway spending. Everyone should be aware that those groups are watching, and scoring, the vote on this rule.

I repeat, they are watching this vote. I know there are many Members in this Congress who could care less about that, but I believe that these organizations truly are a watchdog entity which will gauge this vote.

A "yes" vote on this rule means you oppose a number of bipartisan amendments which will cut nonemergency, nonstimulus spending from this \$19.5 billion budget-busting bill.

Now, it must be made clear, just because a Member votes "no" on this rule, it doesn't mean they support every amendment submitted to the Rules Committee, but if someone does cast a "yes" vote, they cannot claim to support even one of the proposed amendments.

A "yes" vote on this rule is a "no" vote on the Stenholm amendment. The Stenholm amendment restricts the emergency designation from any of the spending that does not occur in 1993.

This very thoughtful amendment, which has bipartisan support, would require about \$10 billion of this bill to go through the normal appropriation process, reducing the deficit impact of this so-called emergency bill. No member of this House can claim to support Mr. STENHOLM's amendment, or his efforts to control spending, and vote "yes" on this rule.

A "yes" vote on this rule is a vote for \$28 million to forgive the debt of the District of Columbia. Is that an emergency? When the American taxpayers are paying higher taxes to reduce our national deficit, it certainly is no emergency, and it provides no stimulus, to the District of Columbia.

The Walsh amendment that was proposed upstairs in the Rules Committee would have allowed it, but of course it is denied, so we will not have an opportunity to delete that under this rule.

A "yes" vote on this rule is a vote for \$1.55 million to the Fish and Wildlife Service for fish research and fish atlases which was in the committee's bill. These might be important programs, but they are certainly not emergencies, nor are they a job stimulus. They are more like aquatic pork, pig fish if you will, and if not, they should go through the normal appropriations process. If we had allowed the Hefley amendment we would have had an opportunity to delete that.

Mr. Speaker, a "yes" vote on this rule is a vote to spend all this money without paying for it. The American people want us to be accountable and responsible. They do not want higher deficits—they want us to pay for our programs. The Packard amendment on that would have allowed us to do just that.

A "yes" vote on this rule is a vote to add \$2.5 billion to the Community Development Block Grant fund that is already backed up with \$4 billion in unspent appropriations. There is no emergency there, Mr. Speaker, and this \$2.5 billion will not create a job for years. The Johnson-Buyer amendment would let us vote on that proposal.

Finally, a "yes" vote on this rule is a vote for \$148 million in laptop computers for the Internal Revenue Service, \$845 million for EPA wastewater treatment programs that the Clinton budget plan said "Don't work," \$1.4 million for historical preservation, \$187 million for Amtrak, and \$9.4 million for a medical library.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on, but none of that spending is for an emergency. None of that spending is stimulus. None of that spending is infrastructure investment. None of that spending is worth breaking the spending caps and adding to the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, this rule vote is a clear choice, a simple vote, and an extraordinarily important statement to American taxpayers. At a time when everyone claims, Democrat and Republican

alike, to care about the deficit, the vote on this rule is a, put up or shut up vote. This rule blocks a number of amendments to strike spending that does not fit the President's stated goal of providing short-term economic stimulus to the economy, including the Stenholm amendment.

I urge every Member, Democrats and Republicans, to join me in opposing this rule. This is not a partisan issue, this is not a procedural issue, this is not a procedural vote, it's not an effort to obstruct the President—it's clearly a question of responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, be responsible to the American taxpayer and vote "no" on this terrible rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the rollcall votes in the Rules Committee on this proposed rule for the supplemental appropriation bill and other votes and data on proceedings in the Rules Committee, as follows:

ROLLCALL VOTES IN THE RULES COMMITTEE ON THE PROPOSED RULE FOR THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

1. Dreier motion—for an open rule plus Solomon line-item veto amendment #3 (see attached summary of amendments submitted). Rejected, 3-7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

2. Dreier motion—for an open rule. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

3. Goss motion—to make in order Packard amendment #1. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

4. Goss motion—to make in order Walsh amendment #2. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

5. Goss motion—to make in order Grandy amendment #13 and Kolbe amendment #15. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

6. Dreier motion—to make in order Collins amendment #16. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

7. Dreier motion—to make in order three amendments by Johnson (TX), #18, #19, and #21. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

8. Goss motion—to make in order Talent amendment #23. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

9. Dreier motion—to make in order Gingrich amendment #27. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

10. Dreier motion—to make in order Cox amendment #31. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

11. Dreier motion—to make in order Stenholm amendment #8. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

12. Dreier en bloc motion—to make in order the following amendments: Gallo #5,

Grams #6, Gilchrest #7, Goodling #11, Hefley #12, and Kolbe/Packard #14. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

13. Goss en bloc motion—to make in order the following amendments: Lazio #24, Bentley #25, McHugh #26, Baker (CA) #28, Fawell #29, Boehner #30, Skeen #32, and Boehner #33. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

14. Derrick motion—to report rule. Adopted, 7-2. Yeas: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter. Nays: Dreier and Goss.

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1335—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1993

1. Packard: Prohibits obligation of any new spending, except for \$4 billion provided to Advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund, until legislation is enacted to offset the cost.

2. Walsh: Strikes the \$28 million payment to the District of Columbia.

3. Solomon: Provides enhanced rescission authority to the President on FY 1994 and FY 1995 appropriations bills.

4. Traficant: Prohibits use of funds unless the entity expending funds agrees to comply with the Buy American Act. Expresses sense of Congress that entities receiving funds should buy only American-made products. Requires head of each federal agency providing assistance with funds from the supplemental to provide notice of the sense of Congress.

5. Gallo: Requires head of each federal agency receiving funds to report quarterly on the number and type of full-time permanent new jobs created as a direct result of the funding.

6. Grams: Strikes \$1.409 million for National Park Service, National Recreation and Preservation account. The money was appropriated for 28 projects in 23 states to produce measured drawings of significant structures and engineering achievements.

7. Gilchrist: Prohibits use of funds unless Labor Secretary certifies that GNP in the first quarter of 1993 grew at a rate of less than 2.5%.

8. Stenholm: Replaces emergency designation in the bill (section 202) with an emergency designation to permit adjustment of FY 1993 caps only.

9. Stenholm: Replaces emergency designation in the bill (section 202) with an emergency designation that applies only to funds spent out in FY 1993. Any outlays that flow in FY 1994 or after will be treated as budget authority provided in FY 1994 and will not be under the emergency designation.

10. Orton: Rescinds \$400 million of unobligated appropriations for HOPE (Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere) grants—combined from FY 1992 and FY 1993 funds; transfers an additional \$75 million from the same account to the HOME investment partnerships program.

11. Goodling: Prohibits use of "Summer of Service" funds for a closing summit conference described in the March 8, 1993 Federal Register.

12. Hefley: Reduces by \$1.455 million the amount provided for Fish and Wildlife Service (Resource Management). The Committee report states that of the \$87.3 million provided for that purpose, \$1.455 million would be available for fisheries research.

13. Grandy: Strikes emergency spending designation in the bill.

14. Kolbe/Packard: Requires new budget authority in the bill to be obligated only after equal offsetting reductions are made.

15. Kolbe: Strikes emergency spending designation in the bill.

16. Collins (GA): Provides that none of the funds designated by this bill may be used for any individual who is not a citizen or a lawfully admitted alien of the U.S.

17. Johnson (TX): Strikes \$4.696 million for additional salaries and expenses for the National Science Foundation. WITHDRAWN

18. Johnson (TX): Strikes \$2.5 billion from the Community Planning and Development—Community Development Grants.

19. Johnson (TX): Strikes \$187 million for National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

20. Johnson (TX): Strikes \$4.7 million for retrofitting equipment for energy efficiency in Federal buildings. WITHDRAWN

21. Johnson (TX): Strikes \$20.663 million for EPA for abatement, control, and compliance to encourage business conversion to more energy efficient equipment.

22. Johnson (TX): Strikes \$37.8 million for items relating to "Forest Service—Construction". WITHDRAWN

23. Talent: Substitute—Economic Growth and Job Creation Act of 1993. Title I—Neutral Cost Recovery. Title II—lowers the maximum capital gains rate to 15% for taxpayers in the upper tax brackets and 7.5% for those in the lower tax brackets. Indexes capital gains to compensate for inflation. Title III—creates IRA plus accounts. Title IV—provides a \$600 tax credit for families with children age 18 and under.

24. Lazio: Provides \$10 million for a National Flood Insurance program that permits FEMA to purchase flood-damaged property and relocate flood-insured homeowners to areas not prone to flooding. The funds would be available for the remainder of FY 1993 and FY 1994.

25. Bentley: Requires Federal agency heads to certify that funds spent under this act are used to purchase American produced materials and labor.

26. McHugh: Deletes \$800 thousand for design and preliminary planning of the Ocoee River Olympic Venue for whitewater canoeing during the 1996 Olympics.

27. Gingrich: Strikes \$1 billion for the summer youth employment program.

28. Baker (CA): Strike \$4.7 million for undertaking energy efficiencies in federal buildings by retrofitting equipment.

29. Fawell: Adds a new title which contains a government-wide rescission list of 747 Federally funded projects.

30. Boehner: Strikes activities that are not authorized in law as appropriate uses of Chapter 1 funds.

31. Cox: Strikes \$148 million for IRS tax systems modernization.

32. Skeen: Strikes the phrase "unless expressly so provided herein" which has the effect of making all funds appropriated in the bill lapse after September 30, 1993 unless obligated by that date.

33. Boehner: Strikes \$9.4 million for National Institute of Health/National Library of Medicine.

34. DeLauro: Upon effective date, a State shall have the flexibility to transfer its FY 1993 apportionments from the Interstate Construction Program or the Interstate Substitution Program among the National Highway Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, Surface Transportation program, Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program and Interstate Maintenance Program, provided that the transfer shall not exceed 100 percent of a State's FY 1993 apportionment for that specific category.

35. DeLauro: Upon effective date, a State shall have the flexibility to transfer its FY 1993 apportionments among the Interstate Construction Program, the National Highway Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, Surface Transportation program, Highway Bridge

Replacement and Rehabilitation Program and Interstate Maintenance Program, provided that the transfer shall not exceed 100 percent of a State's FY 1993 apportionment for that specific category.

36. Barrett (WI): Adds rehabilitation and construction of schools to the list of projects eligible for funding under the Community Development Block Grants (CDBG).

37. Barrett (WI): Federal Aid Highway—Requires that the State of Washington allocate funding to the largest metropolitan area which is proportional to the percentage of the state's population which resides in that area.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 95TH–103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted ¹	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent ²	Number	Percent ³
95th (1977–78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979–80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981–82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983–84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985–86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987–88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989–90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991–92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993–94)	8	0	0	8	100

¹ Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

² Open rules are those which permit any member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

³ Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rules, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Source: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th–102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Congress, through Mar. 17, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONG.

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D-5; R-25)	3 (D-0; R-3)	PQ: 246–176. A: 258–164. (Feb. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: Motor voter	9 (D-1; R-8)	1 (D-0; R-1)	PQ: 248–171. A: 249–170. (Feb. 4, 1993).
H. Res. 81, Feb. 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 6: Family planning	8 (D-0; R-8)	1 (D-0; R-1)	
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D-2; R-5)	0	PQ: 243–172. A: 237–178. (Feb. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D-1; R-8)	3 (D-0; R-3)	PQ: 248–166. A: 249–163. (Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (D-4; R-9)	8 (D-3; R-5)	PQ: 247–170. A: 248–170. (Mar. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental appropriations	37 (D-8; R-29)	1 (not submitted) (D-1; R-0)	
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D-2; R-12)	4 (1-D not submitted) (D-2; R-2)	

Note.—Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tonight, we must make a choice. It is not an easy choice, but it is a clear choice.

We either support the President's economic package with \$500 billion in deficit savings and \$16 billion in stimulus and investments, or we oppose it.

For many of us most concerned with reducing the deficit, it might be easy to vote "No" on the stimulus/investment package.

But the reality is this: If fiscal conservatives kill the investment package, liberals will kill the budget resolution and budget cuts. This Congress and our country could end up with budget gridlock—the worst of all worlds.

Sometimes, democracy demands compromise. The fact that we have a House and a Senate is itself a compromise of our Founding Fathers—one that has served our Nation well.

Today, we must compromise: not our principles, but our personal agendas. Personally, I would prefer fewer defense and agriculture cuts and a smaller investment package, but I also believe reducing our deficit by \$500 billion over 5 years is a historic opportunity. It will create jobs, stimulate our economy and stop the mortgaging of our children's future.

□ 2130

In a democracy, no one has the right to demand "its either my way or no way at all." Not even the President has that right. That's why President Clinton agreed to put spending cuts before new programs and taxes. That's why he

accepted \$63 billion in extra spending cuts.

That is also why I hope fiscal conservatives will vote "yes" on the stimulus investment package.

For \$16 billion in investment spending, we get \$500 billion in deficit reduction, including \$63 billion in extra spending cuts. That's not a bad deal even for the best of budget cutters.

To my fellow Democrats, for 12 years we have blamed the Republican White House for our deficits and they have blamed us. Republicans and Democrats could each vote "no" on the other's deficit plans and then say "don't blame me."

Today, the time for games and finger pointing and rationalizing "no" votes is over. We must act and act decisively to create jobs and lower the deficit.

I realize there are other options than the President's plan. The fact is any-

one with a computer and an imagination can develop a budget plan; that's easy. What's difficult is to develop a plan that can garner 218 votes in this House. Everyone in this House knows the only investment and deficit reduction plan that has any chance of passing today is the President's plan that was modified with input from this Congress.

Is it a perfect plan? No, but it is a solid plan and one that balances the competing interests of liberals, moderates and conservatives, and urban and rural areas.

To sink half of this plan is like shooting a hole in the bottom of a ship. To do so would sink the entire ship, not just the half you don't like. If fiscal conservatives sink the investment package, we also sink \$500 billion in deficit reduction and what a tragedy that would be.

This package is well balanced. With it, we can move forward into the future, or we can sink back into the depths of gridlock and finger pointing.

If democracy is to work, we must all be willing to work together. If we wait for perfect, painless solutions our legacy will be a sad one of indecision, gridlock and higher deficits.

The time for negotiation is over. We have all done our best to make a better product. Now we must make a choice. It is a choice between gridlock and a delicate compromise. If we undo this compromise, and end up in chaos, there will not be enough cover in America behind which we can hide. Finger pointing and passing the buck won't work this time.

It is time for us to work together and to govern responsibly. It is time to get Government and America moving again. The choice is ours.

I urge Members to vote "yes" on this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very saddened that someone could call themselves a fiscal conservative and claim to support this rule and this stimulus package which is one of the most detrimental things that could possibly happen to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the hard-working ranking Republican on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my hoarse friend. I hope his voice is better.

Mr. Speaker, I really could not believe my ears a couple minutes ago when I heard, or I think I heard, the previous speaker, although I am not sure I heard right, say that if fiscal conservatives kill this porker, the liberals are going to kill the just-passed budget. Well, boy oh boy, let us kill them all and America will be much better off.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a long night, especially for me, and it is a bad time to bring up bad news. But I have some bad news for all 110 of you new Members that came to this Congress who thought that you had been elected to the first branch of the Government that has the control over the purse strings.

Now, that is what the House of Representatives is supposed to be. Here we are in a so-called emergency supplemental appropriations, so-called emergency, which is a euphemism for spending more of money that we do not have budgeted. Nothing is new around here.

Members, new Members, your leadership has given you virtually no power of the purse in amending this supplemental to reduce spending. They cut you off completely, all 110 of you, and not only do you not have your hands on the purse string, you are being asked to buy off on a bottomless silk purse made up of a sow's ear. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK], my friend, knows what a sow's ear is, a pretty worthless piece of pork. Nobody eats it. You throw it away.

Mr. Speaker, on well over 80 percent of the 61 supplemental appropriation bills that have been brought before this House from the 95th Congress to the 102d Congress, we have had an open amendment process with the ability to offer amendments to cut spending. Our good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], is the chairman of the subcommittee, and has always brought these bills to the floor with open amendment, open striking processes. We have had real power of the purse in the past. But that has been taken away in this rule.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that 37 amendments were filed with the Committee on Rules, Democrat and Republican, on this bill, only one amendment

is made in order. Only one amendment was made in order, and it was not even filed. It still has not been filed, and nobody has any idea what is in it or where it is. Is it really only a technical amendment, as somebody told the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and myself the other Thursday night when we were closing up shop here? I would like to know where that amendment is. When are we going to get a chance to see it?

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes a mockery of democracy. The Democrat leadership should be ashamed of itself that it is force-feeding this bloated piece of pork down the throats of this House without any opportunity to carve out any of the worthless fat.

I really do not think the American people had in mind breaking gridlock with ham hock. My colleagues, this bill is a squealer if I ever heard one, oink, oink, oink, oink.

Mr. Speaker, this is not economic-stimulus package. This is the same old spend-and-spend-and-spend Congress that has got ourselves into this problem over the last 20 years. We really tried to kid somebody.

Vote down this rule. Let us kill this pig before it gets out of the barn.

Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD documents concerning open versus restrictive rules, as follows:

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 95TH-103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted ¹	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent ²	Number	Percent ³
95th (1977-78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979-80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981-82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983-84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985-86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987-88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989-90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991-92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993-94)	8	0	0	8	100

¹ Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

² Open rules are those which permit any member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

³ Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rules, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Source: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th-102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103rd Congress, through Mar. 17, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONG.

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D-5; R-25)	3 (D-0; R-3)	PQ: (264-176; A: 259-164, Feb. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: Motor voter	9 (D-1; R-8)	1 (D-0; R-1)	PQ: (248-171; A: 249-170, Feb. 4, 1993).
H. Res. 81, Feb. 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 6: Family planning	8 (D-0; R-8)	1 (D-0; R-1)	
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D-2; R-5)	0	PQ: (243-172; A: 237-178, Feb. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D-1; R-8)	3 (D-0; R-3)	PQ: (248-166; A: 249-163, Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (D-4; R-9)	8 (D-3; R-5)	PQ: (247-170; A: 248-170, Mar. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental appropriations	37 (D-8; R-29)	1 (not submitted) (D-1; R-0)	
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D-2; R-12)	4 (1-D not submitted) (D-2; R-2)	

Note.—Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

COMPARATIVE TABLE ON AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS: 95TH-102D CONGRESSES

Congress	Number of supplementals	Open amendment processes		Restrictive amendment processes	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
95th	13	13	100	0	0
96th	6	5	83	1	17
97th	11	10	91	1	9
98th	9	6	67	3	33
99th	7	6	86	1	14
100th	4	2	50	2	50
101st	4	3	75	1	25
102d	7	5	71	2	29
Total	61	50	82	11	18

Sources.—House Calendars, Rules Committee Calendars, & bound copies of "Rules Granted," Committee on Rules.

(Note.—When no rule was granted, it is assumed the Appropriations Committee called the supplementals up as privileged and they were considered in the Committee of the Whole under an open amendment process as required by the Rules of the House.)

Compiled by minority staff, House Committee on Rules.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished farmer and gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with great disappointment to oppose the rule to H.R. 1335, the supplemental appropriation for 1993. I had hoped to offer an amendment which I believe represented a reasonable compromise in the supplemental, balancing the goal of spending to invest in economic growth with the equally important goal of controlling the Federal deficit.

Because there seems to be some misunderstanding of what my amendment actually would have accomplished, I want to take this opportunity to make perfectly clear what I had proposed. Since my amendment was not made in order by this rule, some may think that my explanation constitutes closing the gate after the horses are out of the corral. The reason I take the time to do so, however, is both for final clarification here in the House and because I understand that the other body may have the opportunity to vote on an amendment such as I proposed. I would like to help further that debate.

I fully support the intent of the President's stimulus proposal, that being to strengthen our economy. However, I do not believe that the \$17-plus billion of the stimulus spending should be added to the deficit. I felt that we should pass a stimulus package that includes spending which truly invests in economic growth and we should pay for it by finding rescissions in consumption spending to offset that spending.

If there is one point I would hope to express as clearly as possible it is this: My amendment would have allowed all spending included in the President's supplemental to go forward, without making any programmatic changes in his proposal. I would not have deleted a single program or a single dollar from the President's plan. Where I differed from the President is that I would re-

quire offsets in other appropriations for the approximately \$10 billion in spending resulting from the bill in fiscal year 1994 and beyond. The amendment would not have impeded the ability to spend money for economic stimulus. It simply would have required that any stimulus coming from additional spending not add to the deficit after 1993. Frankly, my strong preference is that we pay for the entire supplemental, but in the spirit of compromise I was willing to accept not paying for the spending in the current fiscal year if we agreed to pay for all of the spending in future years.

The purpose of this amendment was simply to require that the spending provided for by H.R. 1335 be within the spending ceilings set in the budget resolution that the House has just approved. With my amendment, the spending provided under this act would have been held harmless under the budget authority and outlay caps for fiscal year 1993, but any outlays resulting from the bill in fiscal year 1994 and beyond would have been subject to the current outlay caps for those years. Under H.R. 1335, nearly 60 percent of the emergency economic stimulus spending will be in fiscal year 1994 and beyond. There will be nearly \$600 million in emergency spending in 1997. One cannot argue reasonably for spending money on an emergency basis four years after the emergency declaration.

Tonight we have passed a budget resolution, which I supported, that will move us in the right direction in dealing with our fiscal problems by providing for \$510 billion in deficit reduction and a hard freeze in discretionary outlays over the next 5 years. I worry about the message we are about to send to the public if we now pass a stimulus package that immediately exceeds the spending limits included in the budget resolution. In an era when congressional credibility is anything but high, we do ourselves yet greater damage, and we also risk squandering the current public willingness to sacrifice personally for the sake of deficit reduction.

In a recent speech to the National League of Cities, President Clinton argued that spending which invests in economic growth is more important than spending for consumption. That is the spirit in which I had hoped to offer this amendment. The amendment would have required that the spending in the supplemental intended to invest in economic growth be paid for by cutting spending that does not invest in economic growth. If this body decides that the spending included in the supplemental should be a priority, then we should be willing to find offsetting spending cuts to pay for it. We must set priorities in Government spending.

The election last year made it obvious that the public is demanding greater fiscal responsibility from us. The

public recognizes that we cannot continue the practice of spending money on every good idea without considering how to pay for it. That is why I was not surprised that some of the strongest enthusiasm for my amendment came from freshman Members who were elected on a mandate of change and responsibility.

The economic cost of increasing the deficit could easily more than offset any benefit from spending intended for stimulus. In testimony before the House Budget Committee just a few weeks ago, Alan Greenspan could not have been clearer about the importance of immediate action on deficit reduction when he stated,

Reducing the structural deficit is crucial. And action must be taken now. Postponing action would only extend the pattern of sluggish growth of the capital stock and, with incomes and living standards lagging, would ultimately make it even more difficult to engage in the programmatic actions that are necessary.

He continued by saying,

I find misplaced the fear that deficit reduction would be overdone and create an undesirable degree of 'fiscal drag.' It seems to me highly unlikely that in the current political environment the Congress and the Administration would cut too much too soon from the deficit. Fiscal policymakers in turn, by taking difficult but necessary measures to reduce the structural deficit now, can enhance the growth of the economy and promote rising living standards for the American people for years to come.

Like the President, I care about economic stimulus. I believe that it can be achieved only through the pairing of careful investment and deficit reduction.

Based on the House being prevented from considering my amendment, I regrettably must oppose the rule tonight.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Sanibel, FL, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], a hard-working member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, ask average Americans what emergency means to them, and likely they will tell you a fire, a hurricane, somebody choking, the crash landing of an airplane, something you might call 911 about.

There is no emergency that is dictating the urgent need to go \$19 billion-plus further into debt at this time when we are trying to reduce our debt and asking Americans to sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, the emergency before us is the budget deficit. We are broke. We are \$4 trillion in the hole, and we are heading for \$5 trillion. We have spent too much, and we should be cutting back today, not trying to pass more.

If we pass this so-called stimulus pork-filled package, perhaps somebody

had better call 911 and get some help for our national economy and the American people.

Some would have us believe that Congress owes the President an up-or-down vote on the stimulus package, that our votes today are the supreme test of some type of party loyalty, and I am truly saddened and somewhat amazed that the Democrat majority on the Committee on Rules, especially in today's climate for change, has charged down the path lockstep with a closed rule offering a take-it-or-leave-it option.

We are a separate branch of government by design, and we have a separate responsibility.

□ 2140

This is gridlock to lockstep. We had many legitimate, worthwhile and cost-saving amendments from dozens of Members on both sides of the aisle that fell by the wayside in the rules process. We do not work for the President. We work for the people, and we owe them more than a rubber stamp on a deficit spending bill whose merits have melted away faster than the snow outside. But we do work with the President—and we try to improve his proposals when we can—that is what this is about.

Amendments were offered from both sides of the aisle to remove the most egregious examples of the skewed priorities in this bill and you have heard some of them.

Members will vote for this closed rule and vote for this bill if they are satisfied with Congress' deficit reduction track record to date. But Members who recognize that change means more than a nifty campaign slogan will join me in opposing both the rule and the bill.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I can stand here, reel off numbers, and yet, not convince my colleagues of the need for this economic stimulus package. For many the hard numbers—lost jobs and closed plants—just aren't compelling. But today I heard of a worker from a company in my State, a man with 19 years seniority, a wife and 11 children, a mortgage, college tuition, who just lost his job. In Connecticut he joins almost 200,000 others laid off in the last 4 years. Real people, people who work hard, people who deserve better.

Today we can vote to give these people some hope. To show them gridlock is over and that we have listened to them. We have, through hard work, compromise, and conciliation, put together a blueprint for economic recovery.

To reach this point, we agreed to cut spending deeply; to raise taxes broadly

and fairly, and to provide people with the aid they needed for jobs, for rebuilding the infrastructure, for taking care of badly neglected urban areas, and for seeing people through a very, very difficult economic time.

But now some of my colleagues are saying that we are on the way to recovery. That we don't need this bill. But, my friends, that doesn't square with the truth.

This so-called recovery has fallen far below previous recoveries on the basis of virtually every economic measure. Employment in manufacturing has actually continued to decline, and hourly wages are now about where they were in 1965.

Mr. Speaker, the case that we need this stimulus package is strong. But more than that, it is part of a package, an agreement under which we all share the sacrifices, endure the pain. Now we must pass this bill as part of this agreement—all of us bound to see both parts succeed, or the entire plan fail. It is your choice. I urge success, I urge a vote for this bill, I urge a vote that will break gridlock and bring hope.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the only hope that we can possibly bring is some sort of relief to the American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my very good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], who is the chief deputy minority whip.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is another in a series of Mussolini rules brought to the floor. This one is a no-spending cut rule, a pork protection rule. It allows one amendment, and it is illegitimate.

This particular amendment was never filed. In fact, it has not been filed to this date. We have no idea what is in it. You would think that an amendment concocted in secret and kept in secret would at least be read to the House of Representatives. But then you look at the rule, and you find out that this particular amendment shall be considered as read. We are not even going to hear what it is when they bring it to the floor.

We were told last night by the chairman of the Committee on Rules that it would be merely a technical amendment. Now we are to understand it is going to be a substantive amendment. What is going on here? Since when do the Members of Congress not have a right to understand what it is they are voting on? Since when do we have no right to strike out spending, which is pork, which is an absolutely outrageous spending?

Why can the minority not see a copy of the amendment that may be offered on the House floor here in a little while? Our leadership cannot even get a hold of the language of the amendment. It is being kept in secret.

It is absolutely wrong; this is Mussolini at his worst.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPELEGATE].

Mr. APPELEGATE. I thank the chairman for yielding to me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the same people who are opposing the rule are the same people who say that the economy is good. They say that we do not need a stimulus.

Well, this might be all right in Palm Springs and Beverly Hills, but I say why don't you come to Ohio and find out about the real world?

My district is 14 percent unemployed and more underemployed, and most of Ohio is very heavily unemployed. You say there were 380,000 jobs created in February; 350,000 of them are part time, and they are minimum wage. You insult the people of Ohio, you insult the people of America when you say to them, "Let them eat cake."

I am sure you remember what happened to Marie Antoinette when she said that.

Many of you who oppose the stimulus package are the ones who helped to bring us to despair in the 1990's with your economic policies of the 1980's, not just Republicans alone, but by the Reagan boll weevil Democrats who voted with you. What were the results? Heavy deficit, bad trade policy where our jobs went out of the country, the disappearance of the middle-income category of people, those who pay the bills; more people in poverty and the refusal of you to take a look at smalltown and rural America, those who have lost their tax base and jobs and now cannot help themselves. What other proof do you need? America is in trouble, and they need us.

What kind of a nation are we if we do not help the very people that this country, as Abe Lincoln said, is by, of, and for? Remember, this is a nation of people, not for aristocrats, not for politicians.

So let us stop playing games, let us stop political grandstanding and do something right for a change. Let us win this one for the people.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 2½ minutes to my very hard-working friend and leader of the porkbust coalition, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to express myself at this point about what we in the porkbust group tried to do by coming before the Committee on Rules. I think that, in effect, we were testing the resolve of the Rules Committee and hence, of Congress, to really cut spending. And I think that Congress has, thus far, failed that test.

An awful lot of speakers today have blamed former Presidents for the Nation's \$4-trillion debt. But I think we have to go no further than the looking-

glass to find out who the culprit really is.

Since there is no line-item veto power to weed out pork appropriations which never have gone through the legislative process, Congress itself must do, in effect, the line-item scrutiny of spending projects, *ex post facto*, after a session is concluded and vote for the repeal of such spending projects.

That's all that the porkbusters amendment presented to the Rules Committee, as an amendment to the stimulus bill, does. It identified 747 spending projects passed last year as a part of the fiscal year 1993 appropriation, totaling approximately \$2 billion, that is, \$2 billion of appropriation projects which never went through the established congressional process for spending projects. And it asked that these \$2 billion of spending projects be repealed. By doing this, \$2 billion of the \$16.2 billion to be spent under the stimulus bill would be offset.

As usual, however, the Rules Committee said "no" to such an amendment. That is, the amendment could not even be debated upon the floor of this House to offset spending which will add \$16.2 billion to the deficit for fiscal year 1993.

□ 2150

I would like to share with you an editorial from the Chicago Tribune. Just today they were talking about the porkbusters group, which of course is headed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] and myself. They say this:

But it (the porkbusters bill) ought to attract substantial majorities from both sides of the aisles in both Chambers (of Congress). For if Congress can't agree to cut \$2 billion for projects the sponsors wouldn't even submit to routine committee scrutiny, how can it be expected to take the ambitious actions needed to erase a \$300 billion deficit.

That is my point. If we in Congress cannot put the axe to congressional pork which has been passed outside of the established Congressional rules for passing spending projects, what hope is there that this Congress can really ever be taken seriously about cutting spending after the taxes have been levied and the new spending spree completed? One of the visions for America should be for Congress to reform itself, for Congress to be challenged. Congress will not be challenged I think until we begin to act to clean up the mess right within your own body.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the rule and of the bill.

I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding time to me, I want to particularly commend

the dean of the Kentucky delegation, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] whose bill we will be taking up. I salute my friend and my dean for the excellent work that he has put forth on the bill.

I do not believe that people who might be observing these proceedings really understand all the esoterica and the details of closed and open rules.

What I do think they fully understand is simply this. The President won the election last November. The President stood on this rostrum about a month ago and advanced his plan, both of investments and also of budget changes, to the Nation, and the Nation has adopted that plan and the Nation has weighed in by saying, "Give this fellow a chance to have his program enacted. Let him see if he can pull this off."

That is what we are really here tonight to do, to give the President a chance to achieve his two-part program. These parts are interrelated. They are I think inseparable.

One part is the budget which we earlier passed tonight puts us on a glide path down to lower deficits, it cuts about \$500 billion out of the budget, to lower interest rates and lower unemployment rates, and to greater development, greater economic development.

The second part of the program is what we are about to adopt tonight, the stimulus-investment program.

Now, we have heard of capital investment, and it is very commonplace: bridges, highways, the so-called infrastructure, airports. But, we also have something new and different in the gentleman's bill, and that is human investment. We are investing now in education: in Head Start, chapter 1. We are investing in health: immunization programs. We are investing in job opportunities and training: the summer job program.

This is, Mr. Speaker, a strong and a unified and I think inseparable package. It ought to be passed as a package. Let us adopt the rule tonight. Let us pass the gentleman's bill. Let us give President Clinton a chance to have his program enacted.

I believe personally it will lead America to a better day.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my hard-working friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], who has been trying to adjourn the House all day long.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Let me just say that tonight the Democrat party raised taxes on the American people by \$402 billion, but they were doing that, Mr. Speaker, because they wanted to solve our economic problems, and tonight after that they are going to pass a dire emergency supplemental that is so important to the economic well-being of America. Let us see what is in that.

Millions of dollars for beach parking garages, a cemetery, movie theaters, gym replacement, swimming pool renovation, computers that have not yet been purchased, they are going to pre-pay those, \$8 million; \$28 million to the District of Columbia; \$560,000 for restroom repairs.

Restroom repairs? That is a dire emergency?

Omnibus fish and wildlife research, \$3.2 million for large river populations of sickle fin chub, whatever that is.

Get this, the study of traditional and nontraditional forms of popular religion in Sicily. In Sicily, Mr. Speaker, we are going to spend millions of dollars in this dire emergency supplemental, it is so important to the economic well-being of America, right on the heels of a \$402 billion tax increase. Baloney.

This is pork, pure and simple. You are at it again. The American people ought to know, these taxes are not going to go for deficit reduction, but for more padding of your congressional district so you can get reelected.—

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank the President of the United States for his leadership for sending this smart, well-targeted investment package to the Congress. I thank the leadership of the House, the Rules Committee, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, on which I serve, for giving us this rule, which gives us the opportunity to vote for the Clinton stimulus package free, clear, and unadulterated.

By voting for this package tonight we can send a clear message to the American people that the tide has turned in their favor at long last, that the spending priorities of this country really do put people first and that the promise of the Clinton campaign is being kept.

One of the previous speakers on the Republican side defined emergencies as fire, earthquake, and other disasters. My colleagues, I would add that 14 million Americans out of work is an emergency as well. In fact, it is 14 million emergencies in 14 million households across the country.

Because we have an unprecedented phenomenon, a jobless recovery, we need this emergency package which puts people to work in rebuilding America, and more importantly, in investing in our children, in their health with child immunization, with their education, with the summer school programs. As we do that, we will be putting women to work in these summer school programs and health programs for children.

So yes, some people have asked the question, is this stimulus an invest-

ment package? Yes, it is. It invests in our children, in their education, in their health care, and it is an investment in rebuilding the infrastructure of our country.

Another question is, can the money be spent? As a member of the Health and Human Services Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I can say that I commend this administration for sending a well-targeted smart bill which targets the amount of money that can be spent, the amount of money that the infrastructure for these programs can absorb in a short period to time, and truly put people to work.

My colleagues, I urge you to support the rule, support the stimulus package. Let us turn the tide for the American people. Let us support the Clinton program.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], a hard-working member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, a little earlier we heard a tremendous philosophical debate on the budget. Unfortunately, that debate occurred in a legal vacuum. What I mean is that the budget resolution, whatever is adopted, is not legally binding. The majority can, and do, regularly set it aside when it is convenient to do so, so it does not offer any controls.

For that reason, today, as in the past several years, I have not voted for any of the proposed budget resolutions; however, I do not want any misinterpretation of my view of budget deficit reduction.

I believe, as it has been said here many times, that reducing the budget deficit requires spending control.

Mr. Speaker, I think the proof of that is what are we doing here on the House floor right now? We are considering a proposal by the majority to spend more money.

Now, this is right after we adopted the majority budget resolution in which they claim they were interested in budget deficit containment.

Now Mr. Speaker, I would ask, does an economic plan that starts off with new spending, is it seriously interested in budget deficit reduction? In the words of a very young actor in a recent movie, "I don't think so."

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED].

(Mr. REED asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1335, the stimulus and investment supplemental for fiscal year 1993.

I think my colleagues who decry this investment package miss the point of the last election and the main concern of their constituents. Simply put, today's vote is a vote for jobs—jobs for laid-off defense workers, construction workers, and millions of other unemployed Americans—the first real jobs bill this body has acted on in years.

It is also a first step toward reversing the failed budget policies of the past 12 years. In combination with the deficit reduction included in the budget resolution, we will begin to once again productively invest in America.

Some of my colleagues may also object to this fiscal stimulus on the grounds that the economy is already recovering. Well, I would like them to know that there are many people back in my State of Rhode Island and in New England who would say otherwise.

Indeed, Rhode Island's unemployment rates remains about a point above the national average. Compared to past recoveries, the current recovery is just not generating enough jobs.

Finally, today's vote is important as a signal to the American people that we can, and we will, act with purpose to reinvigorate our economy. The inaction of the past must give way to action now to rebuild our economy, restore confidence to our people, and reaffirm our commitment to opportunities for all our citizens.

□ 2200

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my very dear friend and our California surfer, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, earlier I mentioned that for 12 years liberals ridiculed the conservative program of low taxes and spending controls as trickle-down economics. By the time the liberals get done with their taxing and spending spree, Mr. Speaker, working people will be taxed out of their jobs, and there will not be anything left to trickle down. But what can we expect from politicians who have the chutzpah to come up here and say they care, politicians who call for tax hikes and then call them contributions, who call for increased Federal spending and call it investment?

I say to my colleagues, "If you buy that double-speak, you'll buy that Bill Clinton never intended to tax the middle class. If you buy that, you'll buy that this is an emergency stimulus package, a stimulus, yes, to inflation, a stimulus to temporary jobs at the cost of permanent jobs. You can talk in double-speak if you want, but the American people realize you can't tax our people into prosperity, and you can't spend down the deficit."

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to indeed say we want to

move forth the rule. We want to move forth the rule because we want to move to end gridlock. It allows us to get to the real emergency, and that is to respond to the declaration of the people.

Many people, I know, do not enjoy the progress of this recovery, and it is an emergency. It is an emergency when people are out of work, when people are hungry, when children do not have opportunities or families do not have opportunities. It is an emergency, my colleagues, when the summer jobs are not there and there is despair in our streets.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge that we move with a positive vote on the rule and move to approve the stimulus to move America forward.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], a hard-working freshman Member who had an amendment up in the Committee on Rules that was denied.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I come here to speak against this rule and to Republicans and Democrats alike. We all understand that it is the jobs that we want to address. But it is the manner in which and how we want to address it. There are those that want to create jobs. These are public works jobs, and they go to the urban centers.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to stand up for rural America. I was surprised just moments ago to hear from a colleague of mine who has a rural district who said she is for this package. I will share something with my colleagues about those in rural America:

They are honest, hard-working. They have a great deal of integrity. They have strong character because they have always done more with less.

This stimulus package does not stimulate real jobs. It creates public works jobs.

I have heard testimony by colleague after colleague saying, "Let's create jobs." Well, I want to create jobs, too, and, as my colleagues know, I also want to participate in the process like many of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike.

I heard very eloquent speeches here tonight by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]; by the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], who say, "Let's give our new President a chance." I agree. I want our President to succeed. But likewise the Republicans and Democrats alike want to be given a chance to be constructive in the process of government for which we were brought here to participate in, and that is not being allowed.

I testified before the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK]. I appreciated that. But 37 amendments were denied, and that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, we seek to be constructive in the process, and likewise we want to be given a chance to help this

President succeed so America can succeed.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the more recent report on unemployment told it all. We are creating more jobs in this country, but they continue to be part-time jobs without benefits.

We need a growth package, and this will help. It comes only after passage of the budget resolution, so it is linked with deficit reduction. So, these are twins.

I sit on the Committee on Ways and Means, and we are going to have the responsibility to carry out this budget resolution, most of the pieces of it, and I assure everybody, as far as I am concerned, and I think other members of the Committee on Ways and Means have spoken, we will pass a revenue package only after the deficit reduction and the budget cuts are assured. This President has linked deficit reduction and economic growth.

Tonight we go forth, Mr. Speaker, championing both of them.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS], another courageous new Member of Congress who came before the Committee on Rules and was denied the right to offer his amendment.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Speaker, we have a new President at the head table, and already he is asking Congress to please pass the pork.

Less than 1 hour after this body put its stamp of approval on the largest tax increase in American history, the Democrats are now turning right around and looking to borrow \$16 billion for new spending.

That's \$16 billion we are going to pass on to our kids, and make them pay interest on for as long as the eye can see.

And what are we borrowing that money for?

There is \$3.2 million for research that includes compiling fish atlases on the sicklefin chub.

Borrowing \$28 million to pay off the debt for the District of Columbia. That's right. The Federal Government is actually borrowing money to bail out Washington, DC.

And, \$5 million for a beachside parking garage.

While most people call this pork, the Democrats call this spending an emergency.

And they view this pork as so sacred, that the Rules Committee prevented me from offering an amendment today to strike \$1.4 million from the bill that will be used to hire people to draw pictures of Federal buildings.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of the new spending in the Democrat's bill is being sold on the notion that spending more now

will somehow save us money later. This is their idea of investment. In other words, they believe we can actually spend our way out of the deficit.

Well, that's like using your credit card to buy something marked down 10 percent, then turning around and paying 20 percent in interest year after year after year. You may think you are saving money. But when you factor in years and years of interest, the savings disappear into a pool of red ink.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats are not simply writing a \$16 billion check tonight, they're doing it on borrowed funds.

That means that this year, next year, and for every year until the national debt is paid off, we and our children will be paying for the emergency fish atlases, parking garages, and pictures of Federal buildings in this bill tonight.

That is not just wrong—it is crazy. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Democrats' pork bill.

□ 2210

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1335, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for 1993. While the American economy as a whole has begun to show optimistic signs of improvement and progression, unemployment remains high and job growth rates are meager. The national unemployment rate is currently at 7.1 percent and has exceeded 7 percent for the last 14 consecutive months. Numbers such as these can only be confronted by a comprehensive economic stimulus proposal, such as the bill before us today.

H.R. 1335 provides a total of \$16.3 billion for the investment of Federal funds in our infrastructure, urban and rural community development, mass transit, energy, environment and technology initiative programs, all of which are warranted and essential for the far-reaching goal of revitalizing an ailing economy. This bill will create 200,000 jobs this year and 500,000 overall, and would provide insurance against the possibility of the economy slipping back into recession. It will foster greater job growth, fund the retraining of many of our displaced workers, extend unemployment benefits and initiate long-term investments in our country, as well as in our valued citizens.

We must make conscientious efforts to invest in our future.

Mr. Speaker, in some areas, such as my home State of California, economic improvement has not been realized, and is not forecasted to show significant recovery until the end of 1993. In the last year, California has lost 168,000 nonfarm jobs. Of the nine major industry groups, only the services sector has registered a job increase, while four other sectors—retail, manufacturing, mining, and trans-

portation and public utilities—have all shed jobs. Currently, California has the second highest unemployment rate in the Nation, 9.8 percent.

More specifically, in Los Angeles County, the district which I represent, the rate of unemployed workers has soared to an astonishing 11.2 percent, more than 4 percentage points above the national average. The economic condition of my State not only warrants a stimulus package, but depends on it.

Los Angeles County, in particular, stands to benefit from the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for 1993. It would provide the city with \$49 million in Federal grants for public works and parks projects, thus initiating a flurry of job creation.

Economic development funds have also been designated to help launch small businesses in parts of south Los Angeles affected by last year's civil disturbances.

This package will bring the State of California almost \$100 million for summer youth jobs, Los Angeles will receive about \$50 million for its summer program, which will employ 41,000 youth. California will also receive \$336 million for community development block grants, nearly \$47 million for Head Start, a total of \$318 million in additional Federal highway and transit funds, and approximately \$44 million for the Ryan White AIDS Program.

California could realize 50,000 jobs from this package through highway construction, summer youth employment programs, and other public works projects.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for 1993, and to help jumpstart America back to prosperity.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we have heard a lot about pork on the floor tonight. I think it is important to point out that this bill went through the Committee on Appropriations without anyone adding any earmarking, without anyone adding any line item. We simply took these large aggregates of funding for purposes of growth and investment. We deleted some that we thought could be misinterpreted when we brought the bill to the floor. Not one amendment was added by one member of our committee to earmark or designate funding for anybody's district.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to do something here that I think the Republican Party has historically believed in. Through the CDBG Program, the Community Development Block Grant Program, we give authority to mayors, city councils, boards of supervisors, and county executives. We give them discretion.

Remember the old Republican philosophy, that the government that governs best is that that is closest to the people? We are not mandating any of these projects that we have heard discussed on the floor tonight or listed in letters to the President. We are willing to give our local leaders the authority to decide on their priorities. That is what this program is all about. So you can yell pork all you want, and it does

nothing but obfuscate, nothing but attempt to impose once again the gridlock which the American people have become so tired of. Let's let our local leaders create jobs and meet local needs.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker. I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Diamond Bar, CA, Mr. KIM.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, throughout the debate this week this resolution has been challenged by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as unacceptable.

Why, because it raises taxes dramatically on the middle class and falls miles short of sensible cuts to lower the deficit.

President Clinton has raised the hopes of the American people with false promises that will not be realized with this huge deficit spending.

Passage of this resolution will harm every taxpayer and every business in our country.

To add insult to injury, after we passed this flawed budget resolution, a so-called emergency spending bill. We are told that this is President Clinton's economic stimulus program. If so, I am dismayed. It is nothing but pure deficit spending.

Take the jobs proposal in this measure. Also this proposal will generate 310,000 jobs in 1993 at a cost of \$16 billion. Remember, these are just part-time and temporary jobs with a \$16 billion price tag that the taxpayer will pick up, that's \$90,000 per job! Temporary jobs.

I find this proposal incredible. Private business created 365,000 new jobs just last month alone at no cost to the taxpayer. Repeat no cost to the taxpayer.

They are asking us to spend tax dollars:

To teach Fortune 500 companies about energy efficiency;

To compile fish atlases;

To study ultrasonic character of texture; and

To provide \$148 million for the IRS tax system modernization that GAO has attacked.

And to provide an additional \$28 million in emergency aid to the District of Columbia.

There are a lot of cities across America that badly need emergency help. But this resolution seeks only to help Washington, DC, even after we have already given them their full payment of \$625 million.

All of these things and all of these tax dollars are supposed to be spent for economic stimulus.

What we have here are more examples of pork barrel spending.

This is my first year in Congress. I was elected and came here with the expectation that real lessons were learned in the campaigns of 1992.

Americans demanded a more responsive and responsible government that

cut all the nonsense and inside trading out of America's legislative body.

Where is the outrage of the Democratic freshmen who were sent here with the mandate for reform?

I can't think of anybody in my congressional district who would support and vote for the supplemental spending bill.

It is not fair for taxpayers. It will harm small business. It will hang up the sign in the Congress that reads: "Business as usual."

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Waterbury, CT, Mr. FRANKS.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats have been talking about "change."

The American public should take that word change very, very seriously. For the Democrats, the word "tax" has been changed. It is now called contributions.

For the Democrats, the word spending has been changed. It is now called investments.

For the Democrats, piling onto our deficit with a supplemental appropriations bill has been changed. It is now called emergency spending or should I say emergency investments.

For the Democrats, reversing one's position from a tax cut for the middle-class to the highest tax increase in the Nation's history, once known as reneging on a campaign promise, has been changed. It is now referred to as being bold and courageous.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, for the Democrats, it's the same old song with a different meaning since Jimmy Carter's been gone.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to defeat the motion on the rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to my friend, our distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished majority first, do they have a copy of the amendment which will be made in order by this rule? Does it exit? Can Members see it?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman directing his attention to me?

Mr. GINGRICH. The gentleman is the majority and controls the time. It is his rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of us over here in the majority. I did not realize the gentleman was referring to me.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have a copy of that amendment.

Mr. GINGRICH. So the Members are being asked to vote, having tried to fol-

low the request of the Committee on Rules, having filed amendments to cut spending which were available earlier in the week, having put them all out in writing, and having had everything stopped which we revealed and were willing to do to cut spending, we are now asked to vote for a rule which has a secret amendment which will be made somehow available at an appropriate moment to rush through without any Members having seen it.

Second, the distinguished majority leader said in the last debate, "We will not appropriate above these caps," referring to the caps in the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask does this supplemental apply to the caps? We are now the same night taking up an appropriations bill. The majority leader promised us we would not appropriate beyond the caps. Does this bill apply to the caps, I would ask again of the distinguished member of the Committee on Rules representing his party. Are we keeping his leader's word?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, what was the question?

Mr. GINGRICH. I know it is hard to sometimes follow the debate when we get into actual details, but let me just say, the majority leader promised us less than an hour ago that you would not appropriate beyond the caps. Does this bill that is going to be brought to the floor apply to the caps?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it does not appropriate any additional funds, no.

Mr. GINGRICH. Does it apply to the caps?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, it does not appropriate any additional funds.

Mr. GINGRICH. It does not apply to the caps, is the honest answer?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the gentleman speak to our leader since he is relying on his statement.

Mr. GINGRICH. The gentleman is managing the floor for him.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues, if they want to know why the country wants term limitations, if they want to know why Ross Perot got 19 percent of the vote, if they want to know why people are infuriated with the way Democrats run this House, look at this rule, which breaks the majority leader's word 1 hour after it was given.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are not here tonight to talk about little matters and insignificant matters. We talk about pork; there is no pork in this bill. The other side knows that as well. These are decisions that are made by municipalities and other forms of government under block grants, which, as I recall, President Reagan advocated and had a lot to do with implementing, and leaving the local citizens the opportunity to make these decisions.

□ 2220

I will tell my colleagues that we have an opportunity here tonight to create a new and a hopeful vision for our country.

I grew up in a time when people believed that Government was their friend, that Government defended them, took care of them, when they were in need. Unfortunately, over the last several decades, many of us who have run for Congress, many who have run for our chief executive office, Democrats and Republicans, have run by running down, lambasting those very institutions in which they choose to serve.

The people in 1992, when they voted the present administration in, in my opinion, said once again, as they had said back over generations in this country, that they do want Government to do some things to help this country and that they believe that Government is capable of doing those things to help this country.

They believe that Government is capable of giving our citizens a better education than they received as of late. They believe that Government is able and has the opportunity to find jobs, to create jobs for many of our 9 million people who are unemployed and many of the 6 million people in this country who are underemployed.

They said that they believed that our Government had the ability to help the struggling small business community in this country that has suffered greater bankruptcies than at any time since 1927.

I represent a primarily rural district and, as I ride through my district and go through the small towns and look at the closed textile mills, as I ride through my small towns and I see the closed and vacant store fronts, as I ride through my towns and see the grass and the weeds growing up in the yards, I know, as the American people know, it is time for a Government to step in that is for the people, believes in the people, and is going to use its resources to help the people of this country. Not the very wealthy who gained so much during the 1980's, but the average guy, the average woman out there that has seen their income shrink for the first time in the history of this country.

For the first time in the history of this country, my children's generation, my grandchildren's generation, cannot look forward to having a higher standard of living than I did, for the first time in the 200 years of this country.

The voters of this country have said it is time for our Government to once again take charge and to do the things that are necessary to bring this country once again to full employment and to guarantee a reasonable standard of living for its citizens.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule that is fair, to vote for the previous question, and to vote for the investment package.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order, since we have not seen a copy of the amendment, would it be proper for us to recess at this time to try and find the amendment that has not been provided to any of us on this side of the aisle or the other?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for regular order, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is to proceed to ordering of the previous question on adoption of the resolution.

Mr. DREIER. So that would not be a proper thing for us to do then. My parliamentary inquiry is, would it be proper for us to recess, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has been searching for the past few minutes for the amendment and has yet to find it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The proper parliamentary procedure at this point is to proceed to adoption of the resolution.

Mr. DREIER. Even though we have not seen the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 185, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—240

Abercrombie	Brewster	Conyers
Ackerman	Brooks	Cooper
Andrews (ME)	Browder	Coppersmith
Andrews (NJ)	Brown (CA)	Costello
Andrews (TX)	Brown (FL)	Coyne
Applegate	Brown (OH)	Cramer
Bacchus (FL)	Bryant	Danner
Barcia	Byrne	Darden
Barlow	Cantwell	de la Garza
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	DeFazio
Becerra	Carr	DeLauro
Beilenson	Chapman	Dellums
Berman	Clay	Derrick
Bevill	Clayton	Deutsch
Bilbray	Clement	Dicks
Bishop	Clyburn	Dingell
Blackwell	Coleman	Dixon
Bonior	Collins (IL)	Dooley
Borski	Collins (MI)	Durbin
Boucher	Condit	Edwards (CA)

Edwards (TX)	Lewis (GA)	Roemer
Engel	Lipinski	Rose
English (AZ)	Lloyd	Rostenkowski
English (OK)	Long	Rowland
Eshoo	Lowey	Roybal-Allard
Evans	Maloney	Rush
Fazio	Mann	Sabo
Fields (LA)	Manton	Sanders
Filner	Margolies-	Sangmeister
Fingerhut	Mezvinsky	Sarpalius
Flake	Markey	Sawyer
Foglietta	Martinez	Schenk
Ford (MI)	Matsui	Schroeder
Frank (MA)	Mazzoli	Schumer
Frost	McCloskey	Scott
Furse	McCurdy	Serrano
Gejdenson	McDermott	Sharp
Gephardt	McHale	Shepherd
Geren	McKinney	Sisisky
Gibbons	McNulty	Skaggs
Glickman	Meehan	Skelton
Gonzalez	Meek	Slaughter
Gordon	Menendez	Smith (IA)
Green	Mfume	Spratt
Gutierrez	Miller (CA)	Stark
Hall (OH)	Mineta	Stokes
Hamburg	Minge	Strickland
Harman	Mink	Studds
Hastings	Moakley	Stupak
Hayes	Mollohan	Swett
Hefner	Montgomery	Swift
Hilliard	Moran	Synar
Hinchey	Murtha	Tanner
Hoagland	Nadler	Tejeda
Hochbrueckner	Natcher	Thornton
Holden	Neal (MA)	Thurman
Hoyer	Neal (NC)	Torres
Hutto	Oberstar	Torricelli
Inslee	Obey	Towns
Jacobs	Oliver	Trafigant
Jefferson	Ortiz	Tucker
Johnson (GA)	Orton	Unsold
Johnson (SD)	Owens	Valentine
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Velazquez
Johnston	Pastor	Vento
Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)	Visclosky
Kaptur	Payne (VA)	Volkmer
Kennedy	Pelosi	Washington
Kennelly	Penny	Waters
Kildee	Peterson (FL)	Watt
Kleczka	Peterson (MN)	Waxman
Klein	Pickett	Wheat
Klink	Pickle	Whitten
Kopetski	Pomeroy	Wilson
Kreidler	Poshard	Wise
LaFalce	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Lantos	Rahall	Wyden
LaRocco	Rangel	Wynn
Laughlin	Reed	Yates
Lehman	Reynolds	
Levin	Richardson	

NAYS—185

Allard	Cox	Grams
Archer	Crane	Grandy
Armey	Crapo	Greenwood
Bachus (AL)	Cunningham	Gunderson
Baessler	Deal	Hall (TX)
Baker (CA)	DeLay	Hamilton
Baker (LA)	Diaz-Balart	Hancock
Ballenger	Dickey	Hansen
Barrett (NE)	Doolittle	Hastert
Bartlett	Dorman	Hefley
Barton	Dreier	Herger
Bateman	Duncan	Hobson
Bentley	Dunn	Hoekstra
Bereuter	Emerson	Hoke
Billirakis	Everett	Horn
Bliley	Ewing	Houghton
Blute	Fawell	Huffington
Boehrlert	Fields (TX)	Hughes
Boehner	Fish	Hunter
Bonilla	Fowler	Hutchinson
Bunning	Franks (CT)	Hyde
Burton	Franks (NJ)	Inglis
Buyer	Gallely	Inhofe
Callahan	Gallo	Istook
Calvert	Gekas	Johnson (CT)
Camp	Gilchrist	Johnson, Sam
Canady	Gillmor	Kasich
Castle	Gilman	Kim
Clinger	Gingrich	King
Coble	Goodlatte	Kingston
Collins (GA)	Goodling	Klug
Combest	Goss	Knollenberg

Kolbe	Nussle	Slattery
Kyl	Oxley	Smith (MI)
Lambert	Packard	Smith (NJ)
Lancaster	Parker	Smith (OR)
Lazio	Paxon	Smith (TX)
Leach	Petri	Snowe
Levy	Pombo	Solomon
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Spence
Lewis (FL)	Pryce (OH)	Stearns
Lightfoot	Quinn	Stenholm
Linder	Ramstad	Stump
Livingston	Ravenel	Sundquist
Machtley	Regula	Talent
Manzullo	Ridge	Tauzin
McCandless	Roberts	Taylor (MS)
McCollum	Rogers	Taylor (NC)
McCrery	Rohrabacher	Thomas (CA)
McDade	Ros-Lehtinen	Thomas (WY)
McHugh	Roth	Torkildsen
McInnis	Roukema	Upton
McKeon	Royce	Vucanovich
McMillan	Santorum	Walker
Meyers	Saxton	Walsh
Mica	Schaefer	Weldon
Michel	Schiff	Wolf
Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
Molinari	Shaw	Young (FL)
Moorhead	Shays	Zeliff
Morella	Shuster	Zimmer
Murphy	Skeen	

NOT VOTING—5

Ford (TN)	Myers	Williams
Henry	Quillen	

□ 2246

Mr. EWING changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BISHOP changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 132, just adopted, I call up for further consideration the bill (H.R. 1335) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 1335 is as follows:

H.R. 1335

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE
BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Buildings and facilities", \$37,569,000, to remain available until the end of fiscal year 1993.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$4,000,000.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE
WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION
OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Watershed and flood prevention operations", \$46,961,000 for the costs of emergency watershed protection operations and for small watershed operations, to remain available until the end of fiscal year 1993.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION
RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM
ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for the "Rural housing insurance fund program account", for the costs of very low-income housing repair direct loans, \$1,124,000 to subsidize additional gross obligations for the principal amount of loans not to exceed \$2,818,000; and in addition, \$4,297,000 for the cost of guaranteed unsubsidized section 502 loans, for total loan principal not to exceed \$234,805,000.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
RURAL DEVELOPMENT INSURANCE FUND
PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for the "Rural development insurance fund program account", for the costs of water and sewer direct loans, \$66,821,000, to subsidize additional gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$470,000,000.

RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Rural water and waste disposal grants", \$281,767,000, to remain available until the end of fiscal year 1993.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

VERY LOW-INCOME HOUSING REPAIR GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Very low-income housing repair grants", \$5,635,000, to remain available until the end of fiscal year 1993.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE
CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Child nutrition programs" for the Child and Adult Care Food Program, \$56,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 1994.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM FOR
WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

For an additional amount for the special supplemental food program, \$75,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 1994: *Provided*, That these funds shall be available for grants to States that maintain the standards for eligibility which were in use on January 1, 1993: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive regulations governing allocations as necessary to ensure funds are received by States most in need and able to spend additional funds.

THE EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
(TEFAP)

For an additional amount for "The emergency food assistance program", \$23,481,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 214(h) of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983, as amended, commodities purchased with these funds may be delivered to States through December 31, 1993.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Economic development assistance programs", \$93,922,000.

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

For an additional amount for "Minority business development", \$1,878,000 for program management.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC
ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Operations, research, and facilities", \$80,773,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND
TECHNOLOGY

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Scientific and technical research and services", \$14,088,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$3,613,000 may be transferred to the "Working Capital Fund".

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Industrial technology services", \$103,315,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$1,400,000 may be transferred to the "Working Capital Fund".

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND
INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES,
PLANNING, AND CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Public telecommunications facilities, planning, and construction", \$63,867,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$2,818,000 shall be available for program administration as authorized by section 391 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

RELATED AGENCIES

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY
COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$8,829,000.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for "Business loans program account" for the cost of guaranteed loans authorized by section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, \$140,883,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That up to \$2,000,000 of this amount may be made available for administrative expenses of the guaranteed loans program and may be transferred to and merged with appropriations made available under Public Law 102-395 for "Salaries and expenses", Small Business Administration.

CHAPTER IV

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia" to provide for essential jobs, public safety, health, and other municipal services in the face of its financial crisis, \$28,177,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

CHAPTER V

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Construction, general", \$3,900,000, to remain available through September 30, 1993, of which such

sums as are necessary pursuant to Public Law 99-662 shall be derived from the Inland Waterway Trust Fund, for one-half of the cost of construction and rehabilitation of inland waterways projects.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

For an additional amount for "Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee", \$13,525,000, to remain available through September 30, 1993.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, general", \$76,497,000, to remain available through September 30, 1993, of which such sums as become available in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99-662, may be derived from that fund.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Energy supply, research, and development activities", \$46,961,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

For an additional amount for "Energy supply, research and development activities", \$939,000, to remain available until expended for additional in-house energy management projects.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", \$1,878,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For an additional amount for "Oregon and California grant lands", \$15,027,547, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

**UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

For an additional amount for "Resource management", \$87,348,000, to remain available through September 30, 1993.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

For an additional amount for "Operation of the national park system", \$146,519,000.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

For an additional amount for "National recreation and preservation", \$1,409,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

For an additional amount for "Historic preservation fund", \$22,072,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993, of which \$9,600,000 shall be for the National Trust for Historic Preservation: *Provided*, That any matching fund requirements in the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments shall not apply to this amount.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$83,591,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Operation of Indian programs", \$92,044,000, of which

\$26,257,000 for school operations shall become available for obligation on July 1, 1993 and remain available for obligation until September 30, 1994; and \$65,787,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1993.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$10,332,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For an additional amount for "National forest system", to be used for maintenance, repairs, rehabilitation, and natural resource conservation activities, \$150,000,000, to remain available for obligation until the end of fiscal year 1993.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", to be used for recreation facility and trail construction, \$37,844,000, to remain available for obligation until the end of fiscal year 1993.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY CONSERVATION

For enhanced "Energy conservation" activities, \$100,778,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$28,177,000 shall be for implementation of titles III, IV, and V of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-486), including no less than \$25,677,000 for the acquisition of alternative-fuel vehicles for the Federal fleet and for the conversion of existing vehicles in the Federal fleet to alternative fuels: *Provided*, That such funds shall only be used to pay the cost differential between the alternative-fuel vehicle and the same model of vehicle in its conventional-fuel design, not to exceed \$3,500 for any vehicle; and of which \$18,784,000 shall be for full funding for a one-time special award of grants under the Institutional Conservation Program; and of which \$46,961,000 shall be for grants to States for the Weatherization Assistance Program; and of which \$5,635,000 shall be available to the Federal Energy Management Program for expanded training, site audit, and other support functions; and of which \$1,221,000 shall be available to establish a fund administered by the Federal Energy Management Program to provide financial assistance for cost-effective energy efficiency improvements to facilities of any Federal agencies other than the Departments of Defense, Energy, and Veterans Affairs, and the General Services Administration.

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

**EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION
TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES**

For an additional amount for "Training and Employment Services", \$1,000,000,000, to carry into effect the Job Training Partnership Act, of which \$10,500,000 is for activities under part D of title IV of such Act, and \$989,500,000 for activities under part B of title II of such Act: *Provided*, That of the funds provided herein for part B of title II, \$18,500,000 shall be for territories and entities specified by section 252(a) of the Act, which shall be allotted based on the allotment methodology made to such areas under Public Law 102-170, of which \$6,000,000 must be used only to provide academic enrichment activities, as defined by the Secretary: *Pro-*

vided further, That of the funds provided herein for part B of title II, each State and service delivery area shall be allotted an amount which, when added to its allotment from Public Law 102-170, results in a total amount which is 25 percent above the total of its allotments under Public Laws 101-517 and 102-302, except that such allotment to each State and service delivery area under this proviso shall be reduced by the amount of its unexpended carryover as of January 30, 1993: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided herein for part B of title II, \$294,000,000 shall be for academic enrichment, as defined by the Secretary, and shall be allotted among States and allocated among service delivery areas on the basis of the relative number of economically disadvantaged youth, as defined in section 262 of the Act, in such areas as compared to the total number of economically disadvantaged youth in all States and service delivery areas within each State, respectively, and only to provide academic enrichment activities: *Provided further*, That funds made available herein for academic enrichment shall not be used to supplant other Federal funds for existing academic services or activities, and services shall be maintained at least at the level of funding used for these purposes during the summer of 1992: *Provided further*, That funds provided herein for part B of title II which are not allotted under the first three provisos under this heading shall be allotted to service delivery areas containing the 100 cities with the largest population of economically disadvantaged youth, as defined in section 262 of the Act, on the basis of the relative number of economically disadvantaged youth in each of the service delivery areas as compared to total economically disadvantaged youth in all such service delivery areas: *Provided further*, That data related to economically disadvantaged youth herein shall be based on 1990 Census data: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided herein, except for the \$294,000,000 expressly allotted for academic enrichment activities, service delivery areas may transfer up to 10 percent to the program under part C of title II of the Act, if such transfer is approved by the Governor: *Provided further*, That up to 3 percent of each State's allotment for academic enrichment may be reserved for State administration, oversight, and support of a State practitioner's network.

Funds provided in Public Law 102-394 for part B of title III of such Act shall be available for obligation upon enactment of this Act.

COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS

For an additional amount for "Community service employment for older Americans", \$32,131,000, of which \$25,062,000 is for national grants or contracts with public agencies and public or private nonprofit organizations under section 506(a)(1)(A) of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended; and of which \$7,069,000 is for grants to States under section 506(a)(3) of said Act.

**STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND
EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

For an additional amount for "State unemployment insurance and employment service operations", \$14,300,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, to fund worker profiling activities and for oversight of employment programs: *Provided*, That of the funds provided

herein up to \$2,700,000 may be transferred to the Program Administration account.

ADVANCES TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS

For an additional amount for "Advances to the unemployment trust fund and other funds", \$4,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1994.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

For an additional amount to carry out title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, \$200,000,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For an additional amount to carry out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to high-performance computing applications, \$9,392,000.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the "Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health" for carrying out childhood immunization activities under title III and subtitle 1 of title XXI of the Public Health Service Act, \$300,000,000, of which \$282,800,000 shall be transferred to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, of which \$4,200,000 shall be transferred to the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, and of which \$7,000,000 shall be transferred to the Food and Drug Administration.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

PAYMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS

For an additional amount for "Payments to the Social Security Trust Funds" to reimburse the trust funds for administrative expenses to carry out sections 9704 and 9706 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME

For an additional amount for "Supplemental security income" for payment to the Social Security trust funds for administrative expenses, \$150,000,000; and, in addition, to provide for making, after June 15 of the current fiscal year, benefits payments to individuals under title XVI of the Social Security Act, for unanticipated costs incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For an additional amount, \$302,000,000, of which \$142,000,000 shall be derived from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund; and of which \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be to carry out sections 9704 and 9706 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SERVICES PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for carrying out the Head Start Act, \$500,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

For an additional amount for concentration grants under section 1006 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, \$500,000,000, which shall become available

upon enactment and shall remain available to local educational agencies through September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That the number of children counted for section 1006(a) shall be the same as counted for 1993 section 1005 basic grants: *Provided further*, That no State shall receive less than \$250,000 of such funds: *Provided further*, That such funds shall only be made available by State educational agencies to local educational agencies upon assurance that at least 80 per centum of such funds shall be liquidated by such agencies by September 30, 1993: *Provided further*, That such funds shall be used for activities that benefit educationally deprived children as authorized under section 1011 and other related activities such as food services, school health services, arts education, and transportation, without regard to whether such activities are otherwise authorized under such section: *Provided further*, That a State educational agency may reallocate any portion of such funds that are not able to be used by local educational agencies in the State to other such agencies on the basis of their relative needs, as determined by the State educational agency, without regard to section 1403(b)(2) of such Act: *Provided further*, That such funds may be used only to supplement, and not to supplant any other funds, including other funds made available under chapter 1 of title I of such Act or under any other Federal program: *Provided further*, That such funds, and the activities carried out with such funds, shall not be subject to or considered in applying section 1006(a)(1)(B)-(D), 1019, 1020, 1021, or 1432(b) of such Act or to section 412(b) of the General Education Provisions Act: *Provided further*, That such funds shall not be treated as funds appropriated, allocated, or received under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the purpose of section 1403, 1404, 1405, or 1432(b)(1) of such Act: *Provided further*, That such funds shall not be taken into account for purposes of determining the allocation of funds for any fiscal year under any Federal program.

For an additional amount for grants to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, to carry out subpart 1 of part A of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, \$234,805,000, which shall be allocated to such jurisdictions, notwithstanding any other provision of law, so that all counties that, under title III of Public Law 102-394, are allocated less than 92 per centum of the amount they were allocated under such subpart for fiscal year 1992 shall be allocated, under Public Law 102-394 plus this additional amount, 92 per centum of the amount such counties received under such subpart for fiscal year 1992: *Provided*, That such allocations to States shall be ratably reduced if necessary: *Provided further*, That each State shall distribute its portion of such funds to local educational agencies in the State so that all such agencies that, under title III of Public Law 102-394, are receiving less than 92 per centum of the amount they received under such subpart for fiscal year 1992 shall receive, under Public Law 102-394 plus this additional amount, an amount not to exceed 92 per centum of such fiscal year 1992 amount, which percentage shall be ratably reduced as necessary: *Provided further*, That such funds shall not be treated as funds appropriated, allocated, or received under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the purposes of sections 1403, 1404, and 1405 of such Act: *Provided further*, That such funds shall not be taken into account for purposes of de-

termining the allocation of funds for any fiscal year under any Federal program.

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Student financial assistance" for payment of awards made under subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, \$1,863,730,000, which shall be available through September 30, 1994, of which \$493,000,000 shall be available for such awards made for award year 1993-1994, and \$1,370,730,000 shall be available for such awards for the 1992-1993 and prior award years.

CHAPTER VIII

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

The language under this heading in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, is amended by—

(a) deleting "\$2,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,250,000,000"; and

(b) deleting "\$1,800,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,050,000,000";

Provided, That the increase in commitment authority made available by this Act shall be credited entirely to the discretionary fund established by section 507(c)(1) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2206(c)(1)), without regard to apportionment under sections 507(a) and 507(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. App. 2206(a) and 2206(b)), or minimum distributions required by sections 507(c)(2) through 507(c)(4) and 508(d) of such Act (49 U.S.C. App. 2206(c)(2)-2206(c)(4) and 2207(d)).

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

The language under this heading in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, is amended by deleting "\$15,326,750,000" and inserting "\$18,303,000,000": *Provided*, That section 310(c) of said Act is amended by renumbering existing subsection (2) as subsection (2)(B) and by adding a new subsection (2)(A) as follows:

"(2)(A) ninety days after distribution of any increase in the fiscal year 1993 obligation limitation, as enacted October 6, 1992, revise the distribution of such increased funds under subsection (a) if a State has not obligated and received bids on projects for the increased amount distributed, and redistribute amounts to all States able to obligate amounts on projects for which bids can be received no later than August 1, 1993;"

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD

PASSENGER CORPORATION

For an additional amount for "Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation" for capital improvements grants, \$187,844,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FORMULA GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Formula grants" for capital grants, \$466,490,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993, of which \$17,423,000 shall be apportioned under section 16, \$26,420,000 under section 18, and \$422,647,000 under section 9 of the Federal

Transit Act, as amended: *Provided*, That, if any such funds are not obligated within 90 days of enactment of this Act, such funds shall be allocated for any eligible capital project under such Act, at the discretion of the Secretary.

The language under this heading in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, is amended by deleting "\$1,700,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,182,340,000".

TRUST FUND SHARE OF TRANSIT PROGRAMS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

The language under this heading in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, is amended by deleting "\$1,134,150,000" and inserting "\$1,150,000,000" and by deleting "\$1,049,025,000" and inserting "\$1,064,875,000". *Provided*, That these additional funds shall be apportioned under section 9 of the Federal Transit Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That if any such funds are not obligated within 90 days of enactment of this Act, such funds shall be allocated for any eligible capital project under the Federal Transit Act, at the discretion of the Secretary.

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Discretionary grants", \$270,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That none of the funds may be available for grants under section 3(k)(1)(A) or section 3(k)(1)(B) of the Federal Transit Act, as amended.

CHAPTER IX

**TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND
GENERAL GOVERNMENT**

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

**INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE
INFORMATION SYSTEMS**

For an additional amount for "Information systems", \$148,397,000, to fund procurement of computer and telecommunications equipment and services.

INDEPENDENT AGENCY

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

**PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE
FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND**

For an additional amount for the "Federal Buildings Fund", \$4,696,000 for additional projects to improve energy efficiency at General Services Administration facilities.

CHAPTER X

**DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES**

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

**VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
MEDICAL CARE**

For an additional amount for "Medical care", \$201,933,000, for nonrecurring maintenance projects in Department of Veterans Affairs health care facilities.

For an additional amount for "Medical care", \$751,000, to remain available until expended, for additional projects to improve energy efficiency at Department of Veterans Affairs facilities.

**DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS**

For an additional amount for "Construction, minor projects", \$32,873,000, for miscellaneous projects and the National Cemetery Program.

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT**

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE

**TRANSITIONAL AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING
DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM**

For an additional amount for "Transitional and supportive housing demonstration program", \$423,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1994: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall fund approvable applications for such additional amount in the order submitted, in accordance with requirements established by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive, in whole or in any part, any requirement set forth in subtitle C of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, except a requirement relating to fair housing and nondiscrimination, if the Secretary finds that such waiver will further the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 426(a)(3) of that Act, the applicant shall own or control the site at the time of application: *Provided further*, That the total amount approved for any one applicant may not exceed \$10,000,000: *Provided further*, That after December 31, 1994, any of the foregoing amount that is obligated, but which the grantee has not drawn down from its letter of credit, shall be deobligated by the Secretary and shall expire: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, by notice published in the Federal Register, establish such requirements as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this appropriation.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Community development grants", \$2,536,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1994: *Provided*, That from the foregoing amount, \$25,360,000 shall be available for grants to Indian tribes in compliance with section 106(a)(1) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, \$4,000,000 shall be available for grants under section 107(b)(1) of such Act, and the remainder shall be for States and units of general local government that are eligible under section 106 of such Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive entirely, or in any part, any requirement set forth in title I of such Act, except a requirement relating to fair housing and nondiscrimination, the environment, and labor standards, if the Secretary finds that such waiver will further the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That after December 31, 1994, any of the foregoing amount that is obligated, but which the grantee has not drawn down from its letter of credit, shall be deobligated by the Secretary and shall expire.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

**COMMISSION ON NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY
SERVICE**

PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Programs and activities", \$15,000,000.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

ABATEMENT, CONTROL, AND COMPLIANCE

For an additional amount for "Abatement, control, and compliance", \$20,663,000.

PROGRAM AND RESEARCH OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Program and research operations", \$2,818,000.

**STATE REVOLVING FUNDS/CONSTRUCTION
GRANTS**

For an additional amount for "State revolving funds/construction grants", to make

grants under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, \$845,300,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 602(b)(2) of such Act, no State match shall be required for this additional amount: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 602(b)(3) of such Act, States shall enter into binding commitments to provide assistance in an amount equal to 100 percent of the amount of each grant payment within one year after receipt of such grant payment from this additional amount.

For an additional amount for "State revolving funds/construction grants", to make grants authorized under section 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, \$46,961,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 319(h)(3) of such Act, no State match shall be required for this additional amount.

**NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE
ADMINISTRATION**

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For an additional amount for "Research and development", \$4,696,000.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Research and related activities", \$197,230,000.

**ACADEMIC RESEARCH FACILITIES AND
INSTRUMENTATION**

For an additional amount for "Academic research facilities and instrumentation", \$4,696,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$4,696,000.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 202. All funds provided under this Act are hereby designated to be "emergency requirements" for all purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1993".

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1335, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support for the stimulus and investment supplemental appropriations bill but with some reservations.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1981 after the people voted in Ronald Reagan in hopes of a change, I voted for the Reagan budget plan that was widely hailed as critical to the future of this country. I gave it a chance. Unfortunately, it did not yield the results it claimed and today we are worse off as a result. During the past election cycle, the people of this country voted for a change and for Bill Clinton. I believe President Clinton and his plan at least deserve

that same chance. If we find over the next couple of years that the intended effects do not take, then we will work to make the needed changes. Supporting the stimulus package does not mean you are necessarily committed to the entire Clinton plan. There is room for improvement and that is where my efforts will be focused.

H.R. 1335, the stimulus and investment package, represents an infusion of resources into programs that will generate job growth in the near term. While the economy has shown limited signs of improvement, it is not up to the level of stability that any thriving economy maintains. A record number of people are still applying for unemployment benefits. The papers continue to regularly report on layoffs nationwide—Boeing, Sears, Roebuck, McDonnell Douglas, IBM and others.

The merits of the programs contained in this stimulus and investment package are without question. The labor intensive programs that get a funding boost such as road and bridge construction, wastewater treatment and CDBG's will create jobs in the near term. There are projects in all our districts that will move forward with passage of this bill. Head Start, childhood immunization and Pell grants are all worthy investments. I believe the President has done a good job of choosing programs which are in the best interests of this country both in the short run and the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I must point out that this package of investments would be far more attractive if it were paid for rather than contributing to the national debt. There were a series of amendments that I would have liked to have voted on, but they were not allowed. I believe the package could be just as successful if we scaled back the appropriation. Hopefully, we will be able to find additional areas for reductions to offset the emergency spending in this bill.

However, the time to act is now, and to give Bill Clinton and his administration a chance to breath new life into our economy.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 1335, a bill also known as the Clinton economic stimulus package.

Mr. Speaker, my opposition to this legislation came only after serious reflection and study. I know from talking to my constituents that people want to give the President's economic proposals a chance to work. I, too, want the President's economic programs to succeed because this country, and particularly my home State of New Jersey, have been mired in recession for too long. The President's plan is well intentioned and certainly some of the spending provisions in this bill are needed. However, I have concluded that this bill is the wrong medicine at the wrong time for our Nation's economic ills. Just as a doctor would not prescribe cough medicine to a patient with a broken leg, this Congress should not prescribe

more deficit spending to an economy already sick with a national debt exceeding \$4 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would increase our swollen budget deficit by over \$16 billion, because this spending has been labeled as an emergency. However, some of the so-called emergency spending contained in this bill is dubious indeed. For example, this bill contains \$28 million to help the District of Columbia government balance its budget. How many jobs will that create? And how in good conscience can the bailing out of one of the most bloated and inefficient city governments in the Nation be considered a national emergency?

Another more egregious example of waste in this bill is the \$800,000 that would be spent to begin preparing for whitewater canoeing at the 1996 Olympics. Putting aside considerations of whether this spending really constitutes an emergency, this expenditure raises a fundamental question: why is the Federal Government even involved in funding a program like this in the first place? Our Nation's deficit already exceeds \$300 billion—when is this Congress going to draw the line on spending?

Mr. Speaker, these are only two examples of the misdirected priorities in this so-called stimulus package. Upon closer inspection, it is plain to see that this plan is riddled with non-stimulus, special interest spending. While this bill does contain some new spending for infrastructure, unfortunately it is only one-quarter of the new spending in the bill. The rest of the bill is merely a hodge-podge of new Government spending on programs that will have little to do with long-term job creation.

It is also doubtful that this bill will have much effect on lowering our Nation's unemployment rate. President Clinton's own Office of Management and Budget estimates that his economic program will produce only about 219,000 jobs—at a cost of \$89,000 per job. Unfortunately, OMB only accounts for the jobs created by this new spending—it does not take into account how many hundreds of thousands of jobs will be lost because of the President's proposed tax hike, which will be the largest in our history. According to the Institute for Research on the Economics of Taxation, the President's proposed Btu tax alone would cost the economy 232,000 jobs. We can only speculate how many jobs will be lost because of the other tax increases President Clinton is advocating. Clearly, the job losses caused by the President's new taxes will be substantial, and will surely outstrip whatever limited job creation occurs because of this bill.

If the President is really interested in long-term job creation, he should begin by reducing the Government burden on the small business sector, which historically generates the bulk of new jobs in our economy. An unfettered climate where small business can thrive is the best medicine for a recovering economy, not make-work Government jobs bills.

Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose this legislation solely because my political party differs from that of the President. I have always, and will always, put the welfare of our Nation above partisan differences. I would have gladly worked to pass a stimulus package offered by the President if that package contained measures that would actually create long-term jobs. Unfortunately, this package is at odds with sustained economic growth.

I am sure my colleagues are aware that in a \$6 trillion economy, the effects of \$16 billion in new spending spread out over 5 years and 256 million people will have a negligible effect, if any. Certainly we in Congress need to address the persistent high unemployment still so pervasive in certain areas of the country. However, declaring an emergency and spending \$16 billion now and worrying about how to pay for it later will not increase our competitiveness and will not give us long-term job creation.

Mr. Speaker, this package, in reality, is not an economic stimulus at all, it is a political stimulus, designed to have Congress and the American people swallow the largest tax hike in the history of the republic. Furthermore, it is irresponsible for this Congress to be voting on more spending without first voting on cutting Government or at least voting for the new taxes to finance this new spending. I urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1335.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for over a decade every year at this time the Congress has had to try to breathe life back into an economic proposal which was dead on arrival—one which was written as if American had no problems, as if there were no poor and the cities were clean and safe and young people all over America had the same opportunity to education and health. We all know that this was not the case then and it certainly is not the case today.

Finally, we have a President who has been to America, not just the America of the wealthy but the America of the poor and the middle class—the America of those urban and rural families who seek to raise their children to succeed in a country of opportunity—the America of those who have been left out during the past decade when our values of tolerance for differences and compassion for the underdog were thrown out and replaced with an emphasis on narcissism.

Mr. Speaker, I know that President Clinton has been to my America because his stimulus and investment proposal, reflects the realities that I myself know, and that my constituents have expressed to me. The President has not turned a blind eye to America's current need while simultaneously thinking about tomorrow.

While far from perfect this plan attempts to provide for the present and future needs of the country in an efficient and cost-effective manner. There are many examples of this: the increase in funding for the Head Start Program, a program which has shown itself to be a useful tool in combating poverty and preparing young children for successful school careers. \$500 million in this bill will allow the Head Start Program to remain open during the summer months.

The \$1.9 billion in funding for the Pell Grant Program, which is the primary source of Federal aid for low- and moderate-income students will make a difference as to whether or not some child on the west side of Chicago will be able to attend college. The fact that by passing this bill we may instill hope where it has died is cause enough for my support for this bill.

I am pleased that this package includes \$1 billion for summer jobs which, while not enough to fully address the crises of unemployment and underemployment suffered by

our urban youth does serve as a symbol to our young people that we care what happens to them and that we are busy looking for long-term solutions that will address their needs. Last summer we saw first hand what happens when neglect is allowed to fester in our urban centers. We watched as frustrated youth rioted and burned Chicago, Los Angeles, and many other cities. We have to start addressing the root causes of this frustration. We have to provide hope for our youth.

This package provides \$300 million for childhood immunizations. Finally we are learning what most developed countries and many underdeveloped countries have already learned—that systematic prevention of childhood diseases through an organized national immunization system is cheaper and more humane than the medical care that must be provided due to epidemics of these diseases.

The infrastructure investment programs that are funded in this package include \$845 million for waste water treatment construction, \$2.5 billion in community development grants, and \$3.7 billion in funding for highways and mass transit. These programs alone will provide in excess of 150,000 new jobs. This is good news for cities like mine which have aging public facilities and large pockets of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I can't say that the President's investment package is perfect. It is nowhere near perfect, but in comparison to the lack of attention that we have grown accustomed to over the past 12 years there is no comparison. I urge my colleagues to pass this package so that we can cut through the neglect and bring America back to life.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I support President's Clinton request for an economic stimulus and investment supplemental appropriations because I share the concern of many Americans that continuation of the current economic recovery is not yet guaranteed.

No one wants to see the United States slip back into recession. Investment in business plants continues to lag behind levels existing in previous recoveries. No one wants to see finding a job made even more difficult. There are still 8.9 million unemployed Americans, with almost 1.9 million out of work for more than 6 months. These are dangers which still confront the U.S. economy.

The House can show its commitment to expanding the current recovery by voting for this economic stimulus and investment supplemental appropriations. This is a responsible package of targeted funding for programs that will create new jobs and provide a powerful ripple effect throughout the economy.

The Clinton administration's package, as approved by the House Appropriations Committee, is expected to create up to 1 million new jobs, including 675,000 summer jobs for disadvantaged young people. Funding for highways and mass transit and other capital investments will have an immediate stimulative effect for thousands of industrial producers.

This package provides \$16.3 billion in supplemental appropriations for investment in infrastructure, jobs and human resources, community development, and energy, environment, and technology programs. It provides \$4 billion to cover this year's cost of the recent extension in emergency unemployment bene-

fits. It also authorizes the release of an additional \$3 billion from the highway trust fund to bring funding for highways and mass transit up to authorized levels.

The President has provided the Congress with an effective plan for sustained economic growth. This plan depends on a triad approach to promoting job opportunities and prosperity. Economic stimulus, investment, and deficit reduction are all vital elements of this program to ensure continued and expanded economic recovery.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress should make clear that it shares President Clinton's vision of a robust economic recovery. I urge my colleagues to remember that the American people are watching our actions. They expect us to do our part to get this country moving again in the right direction.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1335, making emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1993. There are those who argue that we do not need a stimulus package. That the economy is in a recovery. That people are not still feeling the lingering sting of a painful recession.

Well, these misinformed Members have not been to my district in New York and seen the families lacking sanctuary. They have not spoken to the many unemployed that are still hunting for jobs. They have not traveled the crowded, but deteriorated, roads in our region.

There is no doubt that we need this \$16.3 billion. In fact, there are still more people unemployed today, after months of so-called recovery, than at the worst point of every other post-war recession but one. We have recovered only 1 manufacturing job for every 20 manufacturing jobs lost since July 1990. This stimulus responds to those frightening numbers by creating 1 million jobs.

In the area of housing and community development, this stimulus package offers a true boost by providing \$2.5 billion for community development block grant funds and over \$423 million for the Supportive Housing Program to get our homeless off the streets and provide them employment assistance, outpatient health care, and other supportive services.

If you believe we do not need more jobs, if you believe we do not need more roofs to shelter our families, then, and only then, should you oppose this stimulus package.

Mr. Speaker, as Democrats, we understand the plight and daily struggles of most Americans. I urge my colleagues to pass this stimulus measure as is, without any cuts, without any modifications.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Stimulus and Investment Supplemental Appropriations Act and applaud President Clinton for this aggressive initiative to meet the needs of millions of Americans who are unemployed or under employed as a result of the Bush recession.

This legislation promises to both create needed jobs in central Brooklyn and to address some serious unmet social and educational needs in our community. I am particularly pleased by the \$1 billion increase this bill provides for the JTPA Summer Youth Employment Program. This will increase funds available in New York City for summer employment opportunities for disadvantaged youth by 40

percent, enabling the city to employ more than 65,000 young men and women in meaningful jobs this summer. Our community now has one of the highest youth unemployment rates in the nation and these jobs are urgently needed. The Department of Labor has also beefed up the educational services that these young people will be offered, ensuring that they maintain or upgrade their skills while they work in service to their community.

The Clinton stimulus initiative will also provide New York City with an additional \$15 million to provide Head Start services to disadvantaged preschoolers this summer. Since all of the city's Head Start programs now already do offer services during the summer, these funds will enable the city to serve many more additional eligible children, to expand full-day services, and to improve the quality of the educational and other services provided to children enrolled in the program. Significant numbers of new employment opportunities will be created in our community as a result of this Head Start expansion, particularly for the parents of children enrolled in the program.

This legislation will also provide the New York City school system with an additional \$33 million for chapter 1 remedial educational services for disadvantaged children this summer. This will enable the city to provide summer services to more children than ever before. At the same time, the stimulus initiative will help to cushion the severe blow the city will take as a result of the shift to the use of 1990 census data in allocating funds for the regular Chapter 1 Program. The city's schools were slated to lose fully 15 percent of its chapter 1 funding as a result of this shift, jeopardizing services to thousands of youngsters throughout the city. This legislation, however, provides supplemental funding which will reduce our loss to an 8-percent cut. Our programs will still suffer, but thanks to the leadership of President Clinton and Education Secretary Riley, the reductions will be far more manageable and less destructive than they might otherwise have been.

There are a number of other provisions of this legislation which are important to the people of central Brooklyn. Our women's, infants, and children's [WIC] nutritional assistance programs will receive an additional \$3 million. An additional \$137 million be made available for low-income housing rehabilitation through the community development block grant. The city will receive an additional \$103 million for road resurfacing and rehabilitation and \$47 million for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities. New York City HIV prevention services funded through the Ryan White Act will receive an additional \$10 million.

This initiative represents an important downpayment on the massive effort which is needed to address and reverse the immense deficit in human needs wrought by the Reagan and Bush administrations. It will create jobs, it will provide essential services to our people, and it signals an end to the disastrous era of trickle-down economics and malign neglect of human needs. President Clinton campaigned last fall as the Man from hope. I congratulate him for demonstrating such committed, early leadership to beginning to deliver on that promise to the people of central Brooklyn and throughout the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 132, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MCDADE

Mr. MCDADE. I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman the designee of the minority leader and opposed to the bill?

Mr. MCDADE. The Chair is correct in indicating that I am, Mr. Speaker, and I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky reserves a point of order.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MCDADE moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1335, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike everything under Title I with the exception of page 16, lines 13 through 17, "Advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund and Other Funds";

and further to report as promptly as possible a separate bill containing the funding stricken from title I of H.R. 1335 with instructions to bring the spending levels contained in the bill into compliance with the discretionary spending ceilings established by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-508) so as not to increase the deficit further than the estimated deficit of \$319 billion that is already forecast for this fiscal year.

□ 2250

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] insist on his point of order?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky withdraws his point of order.

Pursuant to House Resolution 132, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE].

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit is not complex. It does two things. The first thing it does is free up the \$4 billion for extended unemployment benefits that are needed in the Nation in the next couple of weeks. And, second, it takes the rest of the bill, all of it, all of the spending in this bill, and sends it back to the committee with instructions to find offsets to pay for it, requiring that a new bill come back as promptly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the instructions to the Committee on Appropriations are to report the bill back as promptly as possible on a deficit-neutral basis, in short, without increasing the deficit by another \$15.5 billion. Mr. Speaker, a record \$319 billion deficit is big enough. If these programs are so important, then I say let us find the offsets that we can find to pay for them.

Just moments ago this body adopted a plan that promises to reduce the deficit by some \$450 billion over 5 years. Mr. Speaker, it makes promises, but no reductions. It promises reductions in the future. It is a nonbinding promise that is structured to provide cover to allow Members to vote for the 19.5 billion dollars' worth of additional deficit spending. Spend now, save later. That does not sound like change to me, and I have been here for 31 years, and it does not sound like very good cover, either.

It does not sound like good cover, because, Mr. Speaker, aside from the unemployment benefits that we are putting into the bill to be spent immediately, this spending simply will not stand up to scrutiny.

We spent an hour yesterday going over the dubious spending in the bill, be it golf courses or reducing the deficit of the District of Columbia by \$28 million. We laid out the problems, Mr. Speaker, and those problems are not contradicted: minimal jobs, 219,000 jobs, according to the Office of Management and Budget, at a cost of nearly \$90,000 a job; minimal, minimal stimulus with only 19 percent of all the money in this deficit-reduction bill outlaying in this fiscal year; investment spending for programs like a modernization program at the Internal Revenue Service which our own auditing agency, the General Accounting Office, says is obsolete before it is even put in place. And we are going to appropriate the money tonight under the stimulus package to do that? What a stimulus.

And minimal insurance for any recovery, because everybody that has looked at this, including Ross Perot as late as today, has said that \$19 billion in a \$6 trillion economy will have no impact at all.

But there will be additional costs, about \$1 billion a year in additional interest costs, from now to eternity for funding this legislation.

There is simply no getting around the fact that the most immediate effect of this bill will be to increase an already record deficit of \$319 billion, and add \$19 billion to the Federal debt that now totals \$4.1 trillion, or, Mr. Speaker, just about \$17,000 for every man, woman, and child in the Nation.

Just a while back, we had the head of the Congressional Budget Office, Robert Reischauer, testify on the Hill, and listen to what he said, and I am quoting him: "Reducing the deficit is

the most direct and reliable way to increase national saving and long-run, long-term economic growth." That is the man who is our man, the economist on the Hill. He says that is the way to do it. That is the most direct way. That is the most reliable way.

Mr. Speaker, there is one place to start doing what Mr. Reischauer recommends in reducing the deficit, and that is right here, and that is right now, and not some promise for tomorrow. If you want to spend more money on the programs in this bill, let us pay for it and find the offsets. We can do that.

Mr. Speaker, I have enough faith in this body that I am privileged to have been a Member of for all of these years to know that we can find the offsets and we can find the savings, not with promises, not with some time in the distant future, but right here and now we can do it quickly. If you are for increasing the deficit, Mr. Speaker, then, of course, vote against my motion. But if you believe, like the American people believe in poll after poll after poll, like most economists believe, that enough is enough and that spending money we do not have has got to stop, then vote for this motion to send this bill back with instructions to the committee.

It is the right vote for the right kind of change.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when the President sent up his message that requested this emergency supplemental bill, we decided in our Committee on Appropriations to do it right. We held hearings on this bill—all 10 subcommittees. We talked to the subcommittee chairmen and all of the members on the committee, and we said to them, "This bill calls for \$16,262,994,547, and it is from our new President. It will help as far as the jobs are concerned in this country now."

We held our hearings. We marked this bill up. Mr. Speaker, the bill was reduced just a little over \$5 million by directing the Department of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects using available funding. Because of a scoring mistake downtown we also reduced Pell grants and directed the source of funding for Social Security Administration expenses.

Mr. Speaker, in this bill, as you well know, we have funding for infrastructure amounting to \$1.3 billion. Some more of the items in here are: additional money for the summer youth employment program of \$1 billion; additional summer Head Start money of \$500 million; additional education assistance in the form of Pell grants of

approximately \$2 billion; additional compensatory education funding of \$735 million; additional unemployment assistance of \$4 billion. There is additional nutrition assistance under the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Subcommittee chaired by my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] of \$154 million; and additional health care funding, Mr. Speaker, of \$500 million.

□ 2300

These are only some of the items in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask Members on both sides of the aisle: How would you like to be President of the United States of America, serving 58 days, counting today, 58 days only and say to the Congress of the United States, "I need your help, and I want you to help me"? Fifty-eight days, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have served with nine Presidents. When President Eisenhower was here, he said to us, "I want to reform the Internal Revenue Code. I want to establish the interstate highway system. I want to set up a Department of Health, Education and Welfare." We stayed with him.

Ronald Reagan became President of the United States after election in 1980, and at the beginning of 1981 he said, "I want your help. I want to implement a \$750 billion tax reduction over a 3-year period with indexing into the future, and we helped him.

Jimmy Carter came along and said he wanted a Department of Education. We stayed with these Presidents and helped them.

Mr. Speaker, I can carry you through nine Presidents.

You know, after they are elected, they are our Presidents; President Clinton is our President, and this is our country. I say this to you, we ought to help President Clinton. He is a bright man. He has had the lights on in the White House working late into the night down there for 58 long days.

How would you like to be confronted, as a new President, with a national debt of \$4,353,000,000,000? How would you like to be confronted with interest on the national debt of \$202 billion?

Mr. Speaker, how would you like to be confronted with the matters that are underway now in Russia, in the republics of the former Yugoslavia, the Haitian matter, North Korea? How would you like to be confronted with these, serving your 58th day as President, and you said to the Congress of the United States, "I want you to help me"? And I say to you—I say to you frankly—we should help him.

You talk about an increase, as far as gross domestic product increase is concerned, of 4.8 percent. Go back to your districts and say to your people, "Why, don't you know, everything is better?" And they will say, "Where is it bet-

ter?" Not in Kentucky, not in my district. So where is it better? Where is that 4.8 percent increase?

We have 10 million people who want jobs, who are seeking jobs in this country. They are unemployed.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, we ought to help this President. This is the time to do it. Every Member in this House on both sides of the aisle ought to vote for this bill. You ought to vote for it. Some of you have come in here and picked and clawed at some of these programs in the bill. You do this after all the support we have given you over the years. Why, I stood with you time after time, time after time, and you know it.

And I say to you tonight, Mr. Speaker, this is a time to say to President Clinton, "We are proud of you. You are serving your 58th day, and we are going to help you."

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit should be turned down.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman was eloquent, but I believe that the responsibility of this body is to examine all programs, to amend them, and work our will. Under the separation-of-powers doctrine, it is not our responsibility to rubberstamp the bill of any President. We are the legislative body, we have to answer to the people. This is the people's House.

And I want to say that we should all support this motion to recommit because what we have before us in the bill is a classic example of spend-now-and-pay-later-and-later.

Every dime is borrowed from future generations. We are putting them in hock, and they will pay interest and they will pay and pay and pay. We have heard the ranking Republican tell us what it will cost per job; \$90,000 per job. But I point out also that this body, in the 1993 appropriations bills, still has \$20 billion of appropriated and unobligated balances. Why don't we use the money that has already been put in place to stimulate the economy?

These unobligated balances have been reviewed and approved by both Houses, and signed by the President. We have examined them. We have done the job that is our constitutional responsibility. We have put the legislative process to the test.

This is also \$16 billion out of the capital pool. It substitutes the judgment of this body of Government for that of the people. It is their money. Government does not create any wealth. The wealth that is out there in the capital pool is created by the people of this Nation.

Let them use the money, to borrow the money instead of us, to buy a home, start a business, modernize a

plant, buy a tractor for a farm, finance an education for a young man or woman coming out of high school.

In the long-term, the greatest economic stimulus would be low interest rates and low inflation. Yet this bill goes in the opposite direction, because, as borrowing puts pressure on the credit markets, it drives up interest rates and, ultimately the temptation will be to monetize the debt and thereby create inflation.

Let us keep interest rates low, low inflation and this will make a healthy economy for the long-term. Leave the \$16 billion in the capital pool, let the people who create the wealth create the jobs, jobs that are permanent, jobs that add to the economic growth of this Nation, jobs that will make the United States more competitive in the global economy. Letting the people make the economic decisions would be far better than the band-aid that we are proposing to pass tonight. I urge all of you to vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, you are going to hear a lot of figures. They say, "Oh, this bill provides such a small amount of money, \$31 billion," that it is not important to the economy.

The important thing is what does the amount in this bill drive? I would just give you one example: There is \$141 million, in the bill for the Small Business Administration. But that drives \$2.6 billion in loan guarantees. Banks are out of loan guarantee authority, or will be out in May. They are already using the authority for the next quarter but are going to be out for the entire year in May. They need more guarantee authority for the rest of the fiscal year. We depend on small businesses to bring us out of recessions and a relatively small amount of loan guarantees produces thousands of jobs. So, you are not talking about \$141 million; we are talking about driving \$2.6 billion in loan guarantees.

The same thing applies to EDA. There is a small amount of money in the bill for EDA, but it is very important to get some of these grants out there right now so they can help jumpstart the economy.

Also, there is some money for high tech programs. We need to get started on high technology, let us not wait 8 months. We know we are in need of becoming more competitive in this world economy. We need to get an 8-months' gain on that.

Now, we hear a list of projects batted around here; those are projects which local government could start with—block grants. We have all, including especially on the Republican side, said we want local governments to make

their own decisions. They might spend it for some of the things they are talking about, or they might not. That is the block grant approach, and it is the right approach.

In addition to that, I just want to point this out: Whether you consider the amount of money in this bill a small amount of money or not, this initiative has raised optimism and hope in this country. We do not want to kill hope. It would be bad for the economy psychologically. Hope is so important at the present time.

We have had a turnaround from pessimism last December and November, and now people have hope. Let us keep hope alive. Vote against this motion to recommit, vote for the bill.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

□ 2310

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to recommit.

To pass this bill is like seeing a person who is on a diet then goes out and buys a big chocolate cake with money that they do not even have and they go on a binge before they go on a diet.

In the Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee, we had seven economists who came before the committee. Every economist who came before the committee said it would be a mistake to pass this bill.

Also, this bill has a use or lose provision in it which the Inspector General says can help bring about fraud and waste, because what it means is that the highway people will just shove these things out.

Senator Bentsen when he was chairman of the Joint Economic Committee signed a report that said:

Such programs like this are not timely enough to even take effect before the end of the recession.

Senator Bentsen went on to say:

The duration of employment for Public Works jobs is too short to provide meaningful relief for the hard-core unemployed.

Senator Bentsen went on to say:

Net job creation is quite low leading to a very high cost per job.

At least one member of the Clinton administration knows better.

I strongly support the motion to recommit and urge defeat of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that this legislation will be passed. But can we at least be honest enough to the American people to call it what it is: too little, too late.

We have had a parade of economists before the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, on which I serve as the ranking member. Although it is very rare indeed for economists, they have been nearly unanimous in their opinion. This so-called economic stimulus package is not needed, since all the economic indicators are headed in the right direction. And furthermore, according to these

economists, not only will this additional spending not stimulate the economy, it could hurt by reigniting inflation and raising interest rates. One of these economists summed this up in an op-ed piece in the Wall Street Journal titled, "If It Ain't Broke, Don't Fix It."

And the response from the new administration? Yes, but this economic recovery is different from previous cycles because the unemployment rate is not going down fast enough nationwide, and remains high in some areas. Therefore, we need to stimulate job creation.

Well, if you buy that argument, then how do we explain the fact that the majority has squelched amendments designed to ensure that any jobs created by this supplemental would go to unemployed workers displaced by the economic downturn?

If you are a highway construction business owner, you probably are not going to run out and hire new people based on the size of infrastructure spending included in this supplemental. What you are going to do is simply give existing workers overtime. Now I ask the majority, how does that help create new jobs and bring down the unemployment rate?

At both the subcommittee and full committee level, I tried to amend this bill to mandate that at least 50 percent of the spending would go to economically displaced workers. The amendment was rejected. I then tried to amend this bill to place a cap on overtime which can be funded through the supplemental. That was rejected, too.

It is obvious that the only thing this spending bill will stimulate is a higher deficit.

And, there is one other thing this bill could stimulate: corruption. The inspector general of the U.S. Department of Transportation testified before our subcommittee concerning longstanding investigations into misused funds and collusive bid-rigging in transit and highway contracts. Concern was expressed that the use-or-lose provisions included in the supplemental spending bill could exacerbate this problem.

It should be noted that the minority also tried to amend this bill by removing the use-or-lose provisions. Even if all preliminary engineering is completed and the right-of-way is acquired, it is nearly impossible to bring a highway project to contract in 90 days.

The economists who appeared before the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee agreed that instead of throwing more money at our Nation's infrastructure, we should allocate more wisely the money that has already been authorized. As one economist put it, "We cannot continue building 'Field of Dreams' infrastructure projects on the premise that riders will come." It seems to me that use-or-lose provisions encourage precisely that.

Let's expose this legislation for what it is. The economy is on the right track, and unless the new administration does something, former President George Bush is going to get the credit for it. That is not a good reason for passing more deficit spending.

Mr. Chairman, history speaks unequivocally about whether or not countercyclical spending measures work after a recession. They do not.

And that is not just the opinion of the minority in this body.

Following a June 1980 hearing on this subject, the Joint Economic Committee issued a

report with the same conclusion. That report was signed by all members of the committee, including the committee's chairman, Senator Lloyd Bentsen, now the Secretary of the Treasury. The report found the following:

Such programs are not timely enough to even take effect before the end of the recession;

The duration of employment for public works jobs is too short to provide meaningful relief for the hard-core unemployed;

Federal public works programs often displace State and local programs, meaning that Federal jobs may simply substitute for State and local jobs. As a consequence, net job creation is quite low, leading to a very high cost per job, ranging from \$70,000 to \$198,000—and those are 1980 dollars.

If I may quote from this report issued by the Joint Economic Committee:

A review of the business cycles in the past 35 years shows that government attempts to shorten the duration or reduce the intensity of recessions through countercyclical programs initiated during specific downturns have been ineffective. In a number of instances, the effects of such efforts have been quite different from what was intended. Programs designed to reverse downward economic trends during recessions have frequently accelerated upward trends during the periods of recovery, sometimes with unfortunate results.

To say that this bill will stimulate the economy and help bring down the unemployment rate is a false claim, and a cruel one to any unemployed worker who might pin his or her hopes on it.

And at least one member of the Clinton cabinet knows better.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a moment to respond to some of the red herrings that have been used to attack this bill all throughout the day.

The majority leader told me that he talked to Leon Panetta, the OMB Director, tonight, and he informed him, for instance, that this so-called list of projects in the Interior Department, which is being used to attack this bill, is, in fact, not a list of projects that is in the bill. It is simply a list that was provided to the Secretary of the Interior of possible usages of money, but no decisions have been made about the actual final funding of any of those projects. Mr. Panetta has given flat assurance that projects such as the so-called fish atlas will simply not be funded.

Second, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has already dealt with the fact that for years people on the Republican side of the aisle said, "My God, quit passing those narrow categorical programs. Give the mayors a chance to operate their own programs through the Community Development Block Grant programs," and so we have done it.

In fact, Gramm-Rudman eliminated the Federal veto we used to have on

Community Development Block Grant programs.

All through the eighties the Republican Party did not blink an eye when Government used billions of taxpayer dollars to finance leveraged buyouts or to finance corporate takeovers that had absolutely no economic value.

Now they are having a collective heart attack because we are taking the money which we cut out of military spending and foreign aid last year and using it to attack our own problems here at home.

We are not spending one dime above the total level of spending previously approved by this Congress for this fiscal year, and they know it and you do, too.

It is about time that we dedicate these revenues to transportation needs, to highway needs, to education needs, to community development needs.

The public knows that most of the opposition to the President's plan is political. For 12 years you have had it your way. It is time for you to get out of the way and let us change America and bring America back to prosperity.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit embodies an amendment that I offered in committee. I went before the Rules Committee to try and get my amendment made in order but they refused.

So I am particularly grateful to my ranking member, Congressman McDADE, and to the Republican leader, Mr. MICHEL, for making my amendment part of this motion.

At a time when the American people are calling for us to reduce the deficit, this stimulus package will add directly \$16 billion to the deficit. If one considers the additional interest on that increased debt, that figure reaches nearly \$27 billion.

That is what we are talking about here today. Should we burden the American people with additional \$27 billion of debt?

This recommitment strikes none of the funding in the President's stimulus package. Not one dime.

This recommitment simply withholds funds for the programs—except for unemployment compensation—until cuts are made elsewhere to pay for these programs. That is exactly what the bipartisan budget agreement of 1990 required.

As the bill stands now, all the funding is designated as emergency and thus is not required to have offsets. However, before my subcommittee, not a single witness from the administration could adequately explain why this spending is an emergency.

In summary, my amendment, which is embodied in this motion to recom-

mit, simply reconfirms what this Congress agreed to 2 years ago; that is, no increased spending without equal cuts or increased revenue. That is the only responsible way to prevent a runaway deficit.

I ask my colleagues to support this motion to recommit and to prevent \$27 billion of additional deficit spending. The time is now for fiscal restraint.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, to listen to our friends in the minority, the country is on the road back. If we just keep our hands off the economy, everything will be all right. They have overlooked the fact that we still have, today, 9 million unemployed people looking for work and millions more who have been discouraged and given up and stopped looking for work.

We have 6½ million Americans who are working part-time, who cannot find the kind of work that will really allow them to take care of their families, part-time people who are not covered by health benefits in almost all cases.

In fact, of the 300,000 jobs we have heard so much about that were just created, 82 percent were part-time jobs. They are not real jobs that are going to put bread on the table of the average American family.

In fact, we have recovered only 1 out of 20 manufacturing jobs that we lost during this recession. Only 30 percent of all the jobs lost in this recession have been recovered. Where is the rest? Where are the other 70 percent?

This country continues to hurt. My State of California has a 9.8-percent rate of unemployment.

I do not see any turnaround unless we are willing to go with this President, his vision of the future and his plan for economic recovery.

It is not acceptable simply to sit here and say "keep your hands off the economy." It will heal itself. We have done that, Mr. Speaker. We did that for the last 4 years in the last administration and we are still picking up the pieces.

We have an opportunity tonight to give hope to the American people, to show them we have figured out that a new approach is needed.

I hope we do not sit here and pretend that everything is all right in America. The majority knows it is not. We are ready to act.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the able gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, uniquely I rise not to condemn the President's economic stimulus package. In fact, I will agree with you that I will support the economic stimulus portion of his package. That is not what we are arguing tonight.

We are not saying that we oppose an economic stimulus program, although some of us may question the need at

this point about whether we need an economic stimulus. Maybe we do, and if we do, then let us create one. Let us create a highway program as our new President wants. Let us give the unemployed moneys necessary to provide for the unemployed as he wants. That might be an economic stimulus, but let us not try to fool the American people.

We grew up in the spoils system of Government and it worked great for 200 years in this country, and I do not know of a better system and I accept that.

I recognize the responsibility of the President to fulfill his commitments to those who supported him.

□ 2320

But for the life of me, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how bailing the District of Columbia out with \$28 million to lessen their deficit, when cities like Mobile need money, too, is an emergency. That is not an emergency appropriation necessity, and neither is it an economic stimulus. It's a campaign promise being paid.

I agree with the President, possibly, that we need to give more money to AIDS research, and I know he is fulfilling a commitment to the entertainment industry that so broadly supported him, and maybe we do need this \$200 billion, but how about the Arthritis Foundation? They need research moneys, too. And how about the poor lady in my district who has a daughter with Rhets syndrome who tells me that if we could just get \$3 or \$4 million appropriated to Baylor University that we could possibly find a cure for Rhet syndrome? And how about the other diseases that need the same attention that AIDS needs?

Sure, Mr. Speaker, we need to do those things, and I admire the President for fulfilling the commitment to those who supported him. I just find it wrong that the President of the United States and the Democrat leadership in this body is trying to disguise this measure to the American people by insinuating it's something in the form of an economic stimulus and is a dire emergency appropriation when most of it is not.

I cannot for the life of me understand how the President, or anybody else, can go before the American people and say, "Let's give a \$9 million appropriation to Fish and Wildlife," and expect that to stimulate the economy. Ask the people up in the Northwest if putting more species on the endangered list is going to stimulate the economy, and the gentleman in the chair, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT], is from that great area of our country.

Mr. Speaker, let us not disguise it. Let us send it back. Let us correct it. Let us support the President's economic stimulus, but the only way we can do it is by revising it to make it a

true economic stimulus. I urge you to vote to recommit this package.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, 1 month ago almost to the day the President came, and he spoke not only to us, but he spoke to the American public, and he said to the American public, "You have asked to come here and do a job. I don't have all the answers. But I do have a commitment."

Mr. Speaker, he has shown the courage to place before us a program, a program of action, a program to end gridlock, a program to respond to the problems confronting America.

Is there an emergency? We have argued this before; in fact, yesterday. I suggest to my colleagues that every American who cannot get a job, every parent who sees their child without opportunity, every person who is without health care, says, yes, there is an emergency in my life.

On November 3, as the majority leader said, 62 percent of America said, "We need to move in a different direction." Did they have one single idea? No. Do we in this room have one single idea? No.

But this is an historic day because on this day the House of Representatives accepts the President's challenge to respond and to act. Are we acting perfectly? We will not know that for weeks, months and, perhaps, years to come, but we are taking action. We are not saying "veto."

Mr. Speaker, we took action about a year ago almost to the day and sent to the President a bill that would have, we believed, economically stimulated this country, and the President vetoed that bill. My colleagues will recall he vetoed it because it placed a tax on millionaires, and he said, "No."

Today we are saying yes. We said yes on a budget plan. There were other alternatives. They did not do very well on either side of the aisle, I noticed.

The fact of the matter is, we have adopted a budget that cuts \$63 billion above and beyond what the President asked us to cut because this House wanted to be real and honest with the American public. Yes, we have talked about \$27 billion additional, but we have cut \$63 billion in the budget that we have proposed that will be realized, that will be realized in reconciliation in a few short days, and now on this bill we say, yes, we are going to cut; yes, we are going to discipline the Federal finances; and, yes, we are also going to do what the President told the American public he was going to do, and they responded affirmatively. He said, "We're going to invest in people short term," as we have in this bill, "and long term" as we have in this bill.

It is time for us to act. It is time to respond to the courage of the American people. It is time to say yes to solving problems in America.

Mr. Speaker, tonight we will pass President Clinton's economic package. Before I address the merits of his budget and investment proposals, I would like to commend the leadership of our new President for bringing this day forward. And I would like to thank Chairman SABO for being willing to work with Chairmen CLAY and FAZIO, Congresswoman NORTON, and me to consider alternative methods for achieving savings from Federal workers. I look forward to continuing our work together.

This vote marks a turning point in America's economic destiny. In the last election the American people voted for change.

They rejected the shortsighted borrow-and-spend policies of the status quo that limited our economic competitiveness and would leave our children with enormous bills to pay. They called for a bold plan to end a 25-year pattern of rising budget deficits. A plan that rewards hard work and invests in our future. A strategy that creates high-wage jobs, increases productivity, and improves our standard of living. They asked for a government that reflects their priorities and is on their side.

President Clinton responded to their call. He spoke to the American people clearly and honestly about the challenges we face as a nation and a people.

He presented a concrete strategy to get America back on track. He outlined the tough choices that must be made if America is to live up to her potential. He put our children's interest before our self-interest; the national interest before the special interest. And over the past few weeks, the American people have responded with overwhelming approval of his bold plan.

With Presidential leadership and public support, the House will enthusiastically pass the President's economic strategy.

This budget resolution lays the groundwork for long-term economic growth by redirecting our Nation's spending priorities from consumption to investment.

It funds programs that work and cuts spending on programs that have outlived their usefulness or reward consumption.

The President proposed 150 spending cuts totaling \$247 billion over the next 5 years. He challenged us to cut more and be specific—and we cut an additional \$63 billion in Government spending. Two of every three dollars saved from spending cuts and revenue increases will be used to cut the deficit.

Since 1980, the Federal deficit jumped from 23 to 90 percent as a percentage of net private savings, and our saving rate has plunged from 6 percent to 2 percent. The Federal debt has quadrupled. It is no wonder that our economy can't grow.

This budget resolution will cut the deficit in real terms by \$510 billion over the next 5 years.

It meets the President's challenge of \$140 billion of deficit reduction in 1997. Cutting the deficit also saves \$16.4 billion in reduced debt management costs and \$10 billion in interest savings on the debt.

Why is that important? Because the Federal debt is like a giant sponge, soaking up capital that could be used for investment.

Deficit reduction will serve to keep interest rates down and foster private investment, the prime building block of sustained economic

growth and a higher standard of living for all Americans. If we do not cut the deficit, our economic recovery, fragile as it is, will soon top out.

President Clinton has led us out of gridlock. He has focused us on the future and the tough choices that must be made if the 21st century is to be the American century.

He has put our children's interest before our self interest; the national interest before the special interest. He has moved us from thinking about each of us to thinking about all of us. He has made us believe, again, that tomorrow can be better than today, which was better than yesterday. And that is one of America's most profound pillars of strength.

This is the plan that America called for. These are the goals that Americans share. I ask all of my colleagues—Democratic, Republican, and Independent—to join with our President in this sharp break from the failed policies of the past.

Put aside partisan differences for this moment. Listen to your constituents who voted for change. Our new President deserves a chance to succeed. Let us join together as the American team to put the country we love back on the right track.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide for the RECORD this list and note that every single speaker on the other side, save one, is on the big spender list of the National Taxpayers Union, and I would like to submit that for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues from the other side have said that we all need to suffer a little to balance the budget, and I think all of us would agree that we could all suffer a little to improve the economy and to reduce the national deficit.

But in 1986 we were asked to do the same thing, and that proved disastrous to small business, and the 1990 tax bill in which our then President moved his lips the deal was for every tax dollar we bring in that we will cut spending by three. But in that we actually increased spending, and at the same time we cut defense by over 30 percent, and think about what a billion dollars is.

Mr. Speaker, my State of California has got an \$8 billion debt. We are not talking about thousands, or millions, or billions here, but \$4 trillion. That is \$17,000 for every resident in the United States, and that is important.

But what is important tonight and even into the future? Take a look, and I think when the public views the proceedings that are going on, if my colleagues take a look at a future vote, if those on the other side really mean what they are saying, they are going to say that when a balanced budget amendment comes up they will support it. If they do not support a balanced budget amendment to balance the budget after raising taxes and not cutting spending, then they should be fired.

And I think the American people ought to take a look, and the only answer is through term limitations of this body. Every economic growth package in this 102d Congress was turned down, and I have an answer for my friend from Mobile, AL: If you want help and save \$28 million, then maybe you ought to shift Marion Barry there, and he'll smoke it.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, and Members, I take the well tonight to once again defend the District of Columbia which has traditionally been the whipping post of the Congress, and I guess I should have expected it tonight.

The Mayor of the District of Columbia came to our committee and indicated something that we all knew, and that was that they were having a serious problem in the District with youth and crime. She had initiated a youth and crime initiative, and she asked us to provide \$30 million for it. Bush in his short sightedness indicated that he would veto any bill that provided that \$30 million.

President Clinton came to Washington and with understanding provided \$28.2 million.

Is it an economic stimulus? It is an economic stimulus to 300 people that are going to get paid that would have otherwise been laid off.

Is it an economic stimulus to the District of Columbia who was short of funds, and they keep young men and women out of jail and, thereby, put more money to other projects? That is certainly an economic stimulus.

Will it be an economic stimulus to people who come here and may not be attacked? I think they would think it is an economic stimulus.

□ 2330

To pit the District of Columbia against your city or your State is perfectly ridiculous. This committee, the District of Columbia Appropriations Committee, has fought hard to make sure that the obligations and moneys that are rightfully owed this District are paid; \$28.2 million is certainly a cheap price to pay for the mayor and city council to get a grip on the youth and crime programs in this District.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I will put in the whole list of what is not stimulus in this so-called stimulus package.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague who has the district just to the south of me, my access to the sea, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], made an offer here in good faith. I asked him if he was deadly serious, and he said absolutely.

Mr. Speaker, rather than have the gentleman out there alone, I figure as

his partner from Orange County that I should back him up with an equal challenge and add this stimulus package to it:

If this stimulus package creates more jobs than job destruction, I will also resign my seat, scrape up \$100,000, and I will be more specific, I promise you I will write the check to Ron Brown. He is one of the 12 out of 14 millionaires in the President's Cabinet, so he must know something about entrepreneurship. I am not going to take the time to write 100 times an apology. I have got a ninth grandchild due in 6 weeks, so I will have plenty of things to do after writing the check and resigning Congress.

I am quite serious. My good friend, who I have the honor of sitting in for occasionally, Rush Limbaugh, has seriously put \$1 million cash on the table against the Democratic National Committee as a challenge if anything works in that ugly package that we just passed on in this bill. So it is time for you, to quote Mr. Clinton, to put up or shut up. Give me a matching grant, somebody on this side of the aisle. Any comers?

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues not to commit a grave error as we consider economic policy this year. That error would be in misreading the current economic indicators and acting upon an ill-timed and misconceived economic stimulus plan.

For months now, the Democrats have seized upon the supposed need for economic stimulus to bring us out of a recession. And their argument once had a constituency even among some Republicans. But now, the situation has changed. Every indication is that the recession has ended, and our economy is well on its way to a healthy recovery. Any economic stimulus at this time through some Government spending scheme would only hurt the recovery and add to the budget deficit at a time when we are trying to reduce it.

Mr. Clinton and the Democrats simply have to let go of this one. Stimulus without a compelling need isn't smart. The only thing this stimulus package would stimulate is the funding of pork out of the taxpayers' coffers. A key indication of this, Mr. Speaker, is the list of who still supports the economic stimulus package, which reads like a who's who of liberal big spenders in Congress. This type of spending is both unnecessary and a betrayal of the mandate of the previous election.

Let's look at some of what all the spending would stimulate:

Pell grant shortfalls, \$1.8 billion.
Immunization programs, \$300 million.
AIDS prevention programs, \$200 million.
EEOC backlog reduction, \$9 million.

For CDBG grants, for projects contained in the Conference of Mayors "Ready to Go" projects—such as a golf course, \$500,000; a beach parking garage, \$5 million; a cemetery, \$1 million; historic preservation of a theater, \$3.5 million; gym replacement, \$4.5 million; and a pool renovation, \$3.25 million—\$2.54 billion.

To prepay bills that aren't due until fiscal years 1994 and 1995 for a super computer

that will not be purchased until 1994, \$8 million.

For drawings of 28 significant structures and engineering achievements, \$1.4 million.

To begin preparing for whitewater canoeing at the 1996 Olympics, a \$10 million program that no one knows who will pay for yet, \$800,000.

For EPA green programs to encourage Fortune 500 companies to convert to more energy efficient equipment, including industrial motors, heat pumps, and clothes washers and dryers, \$23 million.

To accelerate IRS tax systems modernization despite GAO's major problems with this program, \$148 million.

To expand educational opportunity with the \$500 million for an expanded title I remedial summer program? Include arts education as an eligible activity.

For air circuit breakers and rest room repairs, \$560,000; now that's an emergency.

RESEARCH FUNDS? FOR JOB CREATION?

Throughout the bill, over \$450 million in research funds are included which are least likely to provide a quick payout and jobs for the unemployed. Examples of these projects include:

Omnibus Fish and Wildlife Service Research—\$3.2 million for such things as compiling two fish atlases and studies on large river populations of sicklefin chub.

Energy research and development—\$47 million for such projects as human reliability assessment and enhancement; materials for a new generation of contact lenses; and non-destructive evaluation instrumentation/ultrasonic characterization of texture.

National Science Foundation research and development—to restore cuts made by Congress in response to grants funded previously, such as a study of traditional and nontraditional forms of popular religion in Sicily—\$197 million.

High-performance computing—NIST, NSF, NIH, and NASA—\$33.6 million downpayment on a \$798 million 5-year program Congress has yet to see or approve.

Equipment for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—come on—\$81 million.

Funding for the Commerce Department's information highways plan—apparently AT&T and MCI aren't laying fiber-optic cable fast enough—\$64 million on a \$645 million 5-year program not yet authorized.

IRS equipment upgrades, \$148 million.

Homeless programs, \$423 million—almost half a billion—that's a lot of money. I question what it stimulates.

Balancing the District of Columbia budget, \$28 billion. That's billions.

This last item in particular is especially telling. Congress appropriates Federal funds for the District of Columbia every year, and has made a habit of funding a dire emergency supplemental appropriation bill for District of Columbia, as well. Including money for the D.C. budget shortfall in an economic stimulus package is cynical, my colleagues.

There simply is no need for this package at this time. The President wishes to spend \$30 billion on a plan to create 500,000 jobs. But last month, the unemployment rate fell to 7 percent and 365,000 jobs were created. This

should dissuade us from any notion of need for a stimulus.

As well, the Clinton stimulus package would be ineffective, overall. Government spending like this just does not lead to significant job creation. Only \$5 billion will be spent over the next 6 months, according to the OMB, and even the \$9 billion Emergency Jobs Act of 1983 created a mere 35,000 very short-term jobs at its peak.

And even if the plan did create 500,000 jobs, it would be at a price of \$60,000 per employee, a vast difference from the \$40,000 it takes per employee in the private sector. What is more, taking \$30 billion out of the private sector in increased taxes could kill as many as 750,000 jobs. Clearly, this would be counterproductive and contrary to Clinton's stated objectives.

Mr. Speaker, all of the political talking heads on the Sunday morning news shows agree. The reason Mr. Clinton must pass this stimulus package is that it is the sugar that helps the tougher, hard-to-swallow budget medicine go down. But Clinton cannot dodge this issue. He should be bold and admit that there is no longer a compelling need for the sweetener.

The President should stop chasing shadows. Increasing spending and paying for it with higher taxes will bring us back to the politics of stagflation, the hallmark of 1970's economics. In any case, Mr. Speaker, we in Congress should not be urging him along this dangerous path. We should recognize the obvious and defeat this untimely so-called fix before we fix ourselves for good.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, the beauty of this body is that so many of us can come together and disagree so completely, as the previous speaker and I do disagree.

Earlier this evening we voted on a budget resolution. Every one of us who ran this fall, with the President or with our former President, Mr. Bush, knows that we had to reduce the deficit. Then the rest of the budget resolution was our new President's, Mr. Clinton's, hand on the new budget, in the direction and the investment, as he calls it, and the improvement in what we will do down the line.

But also what happens when a President wins is he becomes a shepherd. Mr. Speaker, This shepherd said, "I don't have much that I can do, but I can hear the cities that were ignored. I can hear the mayors and the selectmen who say we need help not to raise the property tax. I can hear the children. I can hear the children say that we need some help, that we have to have summer jobs, that we have to have Head Start," which does work.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support the President, very glad, because this is his special touch to the budget.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I just spent the last weekend at a bunch of town

meetings back in my district. The question that came out of my people back home time and time again was do you really think that those people believe what they are saying when they talk about what they are doing in Washington?

My response was basically, well, I don't know, but I guess they really do believe that taxes are contributions, and maybe they really do believe that more government is investment, and I guess they really do believe that deficit spending is stimulus and job creation. I guess they really do believe that, as the gentleman from Wisconsin said, the Republicans have been in control of the Government for 12 years.

That is unbelievable. And the American people will believe it when they see what you are doing to their future, when they also see the hole in their wallets of what you are doing to their children.

During this debate on the rule the gentleman from South Carolina said for the first time in the history of this country his children and his grandchildren have nothing to look forward to. Well, I am telling you, after today they have a lot to look forward to. They have got a lot of debt to look forward to, less opportunity to look forward to and that is what you are putting on your children and your grandchildren. You are so cynical that you refused to allow an amendment to pay for this deficit spending you are doing. Unbelievable. And that is all we are asking you to do, is vote for the motion to recommit, so that we can pay for this, so that your children and grandchildren will not have to pay for it in the future. If you will not think about yourselves, if you do not care about this country, at least think about your children and your grandchildren. What are you doing to them? You are just throwing away their future.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are talking about here, the future, because this will come home later on. When the American people see in the next few months and the next couple of years what you have done because you do control and you do control, because you have the White House, you have the Senate, and you have the House, and you are being irresponsible in what you have.

You are going to pass this. We understand that. But what we are trying to tell the American people is we did not do it, the Democrats did.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, this is no time to recommit; it is a time to commit. It is a time to commit to the American people.

This country is in trouble. Joblessness is at an all time high. Many of our plants have closed, jobs have been ex-

ported to Third World countries, and families are in despair and hopelessness. Young people are on American streets without jobs, without job training.

This is not a time for posturing; this is a time to stop the games. This is a time to make sure we do not end this evening with the American public pointing to us and talking about gridlock.

We finally, after 12 long years, have a President who is willing to provide some leadership. He knew he was going to take some knocks. He knew that there would be those who would posture and use this as a time to divide us and to polarize us. But he has courage, and he moved forward and brought an investment package to the Congress of the United States. He said, "Members of Congress, stop the foolishness. Support investing in the American people."

Mr. Speaker, this is his agenda, to put the people first. It is time for us to get on with the business of moving America forward. Let us not recommit; let us commit and do something for the very people who have sent us here to take care of the business of this country.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY].

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if this makes me an authority on this particular matter tonight, but I think I am the only person in this chamber that voted for both the Kasich budget and the Black Caucus budget, which either shows a tremendous foresight on my part or a complete lack of judgment.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell why I did that: because both of those documents, in this Member's view, were real pieces of paper, with real cuts, real taxes, real solutions, some of them horrifying, but nonetheless honest attempts with no quick fixes in the Tax Code, no unspecified cuts, and I thought they deserved my support.

□ 2340

The reason the supplemental does not deserve my support or, I think, any of ours is that it is not real. It is imagined. It is working on a supposition that there is an emergency before us. Not a gulf war, not an earthquake, not a hurricane, but an imagined emergency.

It may be real to some of my colleagues, but let me just try and put this in a perspective that questions nobody's courage but tries to assess the judgment behind that decision.

There is a definition of emergency in our budget law and it reads as follows, and it was agreed to, by the way, by the previous Budget Director, Richard Darman, and the present one, Leon Panetta.

It reads as follows: "A necessary expenditure that is sudden, urgent, and unforeseen and is not permanent and depends on commonsense judgment made on a case-by-case basis."

This is a letter that Leon Panetta sent to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] in which he also said this package is needed to prevent the reoccurrence of a recession.

I put that question to the Budget Director, Robert Reischauer, who is the person that we not only use to prepare numbers to make these of arguments but the one the President uses now.

He said, "No. There is no recurring recession. And if there were, this stimulus package would only be good for perhaps two-tenths of a percent."

So that begged the question, "Well, then, Mr. Director, what is an emergency?"

And he said, and I think this is the wisest thing I have heard this year, "It is defined by whatever the political leadership on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue think it is."

Now, is that the definition of the end of gridlock? I think not.

I do not think that is what we are here to do tonight.

Mr. Reischauer said, after he answered that question, he said, "Can I go home now?"

I said to him, "If that is really your answer, we should all go home now," because it is a crime to take our voting cards and put them in these machines and operate under a guise of an emergency, when we know that this is only what the political leadership at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue have decided it is.

If that is true, if that is really what we are going to do, then why even have a Committee on the Budget? Why not simply say, let us underfund all of our appropriations and then, when we run out of dough, we declare an emergency for whatever purpose. That is a discredit to the Black Caucus. That is a discredit to the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, and I think it is a discredit to every Member of this House.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to talk a little bit about some of the discussion we have had about things not really being for stimulus. I have heard a list read that, as I would hear them, seem to be complaining because of things that the recipients of community development block grant funding would spend.

We have heard people criticize particular items that had to do with municipal government. Yes, this bill does

provide for funds for community development block grants.

We ought to understand, thanks to the Republican Party, we have no control over how that is spent. It used to be that when community development block grant funding was made available to smaller cities, they came to HUD for approval. But in Gramm-Latta, of blessed memory, the Reagan bill of 1981, we gave that power over to the States. So there is now no legal power in the Federal Government to disallow community development block grant selections.

So much of what we have been hearing from our friends on the other side denouncing what Congress is doing is, in fact, living up to the Reagan theory of letting the States decide for themselves. It is a little late for that reconsideration. I welcome it.

I would only say that if we want to confess error by Gramm-Latta, there are some other points we ought to begin with first.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, yes, in answer to that last argument, if the various cities are going to spend their money that way, we should not be giving them the money at this time.

Let me note that we started talking about spending caps earlier. I was afraid that the Democrats could not find their spending caps. I found the Democrats spending cap. Here it is.

I will have my colleagues know that down at the White House they do not know whether to play "Hail to the Chief" or "Santa Claus Is Coming to Town," when we hear about where some of this money is going to be spent.

A total of \$1.5 million for fish atlases. Hey, \$187 million for a great train set for the kids, that is Amtrak; \$148 million for laptop computers; \$560,000 for restroom repair and \$28 million for the District of Columbia from each and every city around the United States. Next year, if they are really good, we are going to give them two U.S. Senators.

Well, if my colleagues believe in Santa Claus, they believe that this is a deficit reduction package. If they believe in Santa Claus, they can believe Government in Washington, DC, can give you something for nothing.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SARPALIUS].

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, there are those over there who call this package pork. Let me tell my colleagues, I am wearing what is called a pork tie. So when my colleagues want to know what pork looks like, that is what one looks like. Not all hogs are this pink.

But if we think that pork is an investment in our children who are behind in school and we have an oppor-

tunity in the summer to let them improve their skills, their reading skills, mathematical skills and to make productive citizens out of them, when today out of our inmates are people who never finished high school, a high percentage of our people on welfare are people who never finished school, now we have an opportunity to give those young people a second chance.

If we talk about immunizing our children, today under this program we can now do that. For every dollar we spend, it pays \$14 down the road. That is an investment.

When we talk about Head Start, where we have children today who are beginning school who cannot even speak English. These are investments in the future. They are not pork.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 weeks, I have heard some of my colleagues suggest that an investment package is not necessary—that growth rates are up and unemployment numbers down. I say to my friends such is not the case in the Third Congressional District of Florida. The current unemployment rate of 7 percent is still higher than it was when our most recent recession ended 24 months ago. Even more startling is the fact that as the Secretary of Labor said, "The economy is still about 3 million jobs behind where we would be in a normal recovery."

It is time to help the economy create those jobs. How do we do that? By following the President's blueprint for recovery.

Each week, in my district, I am touched by those who cannot find work to support their families, single mothers stretching every penny to make ends meet and part-time laborers looking for full-time jobs. The answer to their prayers will not come in rosy rhetoric, but in quality American jobs.

The President's package will create those jobs and I urge my colleagues to pass it.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], distinguished whip of our party.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time to me.

In some ways, as we applaud back and forth and cheer back and forth, this debate would be funny. But I would suggest to my colleagues in some ways it is truly tragic.

We score debating points off each other, but we are all chipping away at the authority of our system of congressional representation.

In the future, historians can look at today as a case study in the decay of American Government.

As Americans lose trust and authority decays, people rebel in a lot of odd

ways. In Italy, the Lombard League and its allies are shaking the entire party structure. In Japan, the dominant party is being shaken to its foundations, and it may split for the first time since its founding after World War II.

In America, 2 weeks ago in the Washington Post, hardly a right-wing publication, only 21 percent of the American people trusted Government to do the right thing.

□ 2350

According to the Washington Post, that trust number of 21 percent is lower than Nixon's during the last week before he resigned in Watergate. That 21-percent trust number is lower than 4 years of Jimmy Carter's Presidency with 13-percent inflation and 21-percent interest rates and 441 days of the hostage crisis.

I would say to all of my colleagues on a nonpartisan basis, why do 79 percent of the American people refuse to trust Washington? I would suggest to the Members that today's House behavior is a case study. Two hours ago on this floor we were promised, promised, that we would not appropriate beyond the caps. Two hours ago, not a lifetime, 2 hours. This bill is deliberately written to be outside the caps, 2 hours later.

Term limitations are driven by distrust of Congress. They are averaging about 77 percent, in every State where they can get to the ballot. Ross Perot's voters say, "Cut spending and cut the deficit."

The "lead or leave" wants us all to sign on, and if we do not cut it in half in 4 years, get out of here. They all say, "Cut spending and cut the deficit".

I heard one of my friends tell us how government can be loved, and it is wonderful. The fact is, last year the most powerful single phrase by any candidate in the Presidential campaign was the following words: "The American people believe government is too big and spends too much." The Washington Post in that same poll reported that by 76 to 9, 76 to 9, people thought the President had not cut spending enough, 76 to 9.

Ross Perot is saying in his new poll, a \$2 spending cut for every \$1 of tax increase. It should make my more moderate friends happy. At least he is willing to have tax increases. But for that standard of \$2 for every \$1 tax increase, we ought to have a \$34 billion tax cut attached to this bill, because that is how the math works. Since we are raising spending, we ought to be giving the American people back money, because we are failing them. We are not giving them any kind of spending cut in this bill.

Two hours ago the following words were said: "We will not appropriate above these caps." This bill clearly violates that definition. They can come up with sophistry, they can explain how that is for next year, not this year.

The objective fact is, in a country that no longer trusts the U.S. Congress, tonight if the Members vote against this motion to recommit, they are voting for a bigger deficit, for more real borrowing, they are voting to spend money they are not willing to pay for. They are going to increase the amount of money.

By the way, over 5 years that \$31 billion is around \$37 billion, by the time we add in the interest rate. I ask the Members to please vote for the motion to recommit to keep the Congress' faith.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

A country doctor was called to the outreaches of his county to treat an injured, poor black sharecropper who had an infected leg, on the verge of gangrene. He had a young boy who rode out with him, and after the treatment was completed and the leg saved, but the doctor unpaid, the little boy on the way back to town asked the doctor why he would spend all day riding out to treat a patient yet be unpaid, when he could have stayed in his office and earned many fees from treating patients.

The doctor looked at the young boy and he said, "Son, today we had an opportunity to help somebody."

I say to the Members of the House, today we have an opportunity to help somebody. We have an opportunity to help our ailing country, to help our sick economy, to help our courageous President try to jump start this economy.

We have an opportunity to help somebody: to help our youth, to help the expanding youth projects with Head Start, Chapter 1, childhood immunizations. We have an opportunity to help senior citizens with our service employment for older Americans, our urban areas with housing and economic development, minority business programs, our rural areas, our jobs for small business.

Today, we have an opportunity to help somebody. I urge the Members to pass this economic stimulus package and let us help America.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I would ask, is there 1 more minute remaining on my side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, may I say to my colleagues, I will not use even the entire minute. I simply want to remind the House what we are doing here now. The motion to recommit says the \$4 billion for unemployment compensation is immediately released. It does not stop

any of the other programs. It simply says if we want them, we have to offset them. Just do not add it to the deficit.

Do what the American people are asking us to do. Do the responsible thing. If we are going to have this stimulus program, offset it, and do not add it to the deficit.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time, which I believe is 4 minutes, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing some words here: Ross Perot. I keep hearing other words. It is like Tennessee Williams would call mendacity. That is what I have heard tonight, mendacious statements, telling that this particular stimulus package will not get this country going. It will get this country going.

I am sure that each of the Members, regardless of their party, wants to go home and tell the people they represent, "We did something to help you. We didn't do something to stifle you." That is what this budget is all about.

What the Members need to do now is stand up and be counted. Don't worry about your party. People back home don't care what party you are in. You can be an I-ate-a-tater. They don't care. What they want us to bring back to them is something they can use to improve their quality of life.

Vote for this stimulus package tonight. It is an investment in America.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, to those who oppose the President's package tonight I want to pose just one question: Where are the jobs?

Where are the jobs for the 16 million people who can't find full-time work? Tonight, 16 million Americans. That's five times as much as the work force in all of New York City.

It's larger than the population of 47 States. For 4 years we've heard that we should not worry about this problem. I remember that Boston Globe headline from a year ago: "Do nothing on Economy, Bush advises." And I remember the administration comments throughout the year.

"No recession." "Mild recession." "The recession has ended." "It's no big deal." Well, finally we have a President who knows it's a big deal. A President who has a plan to get the economy moving. A President who has the broad support of the American people.

The President's plan does many things. But it does one thing above all. It creates jobs. Let me repeat that. It creates jobs, right now—with immediate investment, and in the future, because it invests in the future. Invests in our communities. Invests in edu-

cation. Invests in training. Invests in health. Invests in affordable housing. Invests in small business. All that will create jobs and growth for America not just next year but into the next century.

That's why three University of Michigan economists said the other day, that if we just stick to the President's plan we'll have an even greater decrease in the deficit than the administration predicts, and even more growth.

There are those in this Chamber tonight who say we shouldn't pass this bill because it's not really an emergency, that we shouldn't be investing \$16 billion now. Let me remind them: The level of funding in this bill is \$5.5 million below the spending caps set forth in the 1990 budget agreement.

But even more important, we need to invest now if our economy is to grow this year—and next year—and the year after that—so we can finally get our deficit under control.

Some say we are in a recovery. You think it sounded like a recovery to the people at Northwest Airlines last month when they announced they were laying off another 1,000 people? Or McDonnell Douglas when they cut 8,700 jobs? Or Sears—50,000 jobs? Or Boeing: 20,000 jobs? Or General Motors, or IBM or Kodak, or the 80 other large firms who announced big job cuts since January 1.

Some recovery. The personnel experts have great names for it. Downsizing. Restructuring.

Mr. Speaker, it's a pink slip. And it devastates families. In the 23 months of this so-called recovery, job growth has been about one-fifth of the usual recovery.

There are still 3 million more Americans out of work than there were before the recession began. Three million. Let's start putting these people back to work.

Finally, let me say this to my colleagues. Bill Clinton was elected President for a simple reason. Change. People were tired of the status quo. They wanted a President who would act. Who had a plan. This is his plan. Give him the chance to make it work. Listen to the voices all around America. From labor, from business. From private sector and public sector. From farmers and teachers. From assembly line workers and white collar workers. From people in the suites and people on the streets. They are voices for change. They want action. Let's pass the bill right now. Defeat the motion to recommit.

Stand up to the guardians of gridlock just as we've stood up all day to those who want only to delay, to deny, to derail, to deadlock.

Let's send the whole economic package to the President. Let's give him the chance to do what voters want him to do. Let's give the millions who need

work and need hope the courage to keep looking. And let them see that we're doing our job to help Americans find theirs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 244, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

AYES—181

Allard	Goodlatte	Nussle
Archer	Goodling	Orton
Armey	Goss	Oxley
Bachus (AL)	Grams	Packard
Baker (CA)	Grandy	Parker
Baker (LA)	Greenwood	Paxon
Ballenger	Hall (TX)	Petri
Barrett (NE)	Hancock	Pombo
Bartlett	Hansen	Porter
Bateman	Hastert	Pryce (OH)
Bentley	Hefley	Quinn
Bereuter	Herger	Ramstad
Bilirakis	Hobson	Ravenel
Bliley	Hoekstra	Regula
Blute	Hoke	Ridge
Boehner	Horn	Roberts
Bonilla	Houghton	Rogers
Bunning	Huffington	Rohrabacher
Burton	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Hutchinson	Roth
Callahan	Hyde	Roukema
Calvert	Inglis	Royce
Camp	Inhofe	Santorum
Canady	Istook	Saxton
Castle	Johnson (CT)	Schaefer
Clinger	Johnson (GA)	Schiff
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Kasich	Shaw
Combest	Kim	Shays
Condit	King	Shuster
Cox	Kingston	Sisisky
Crane	Klug	Skeen
Crapo	Knollenberg	Smith (MI)
Cunningham	Kolbe	Smith (NJ)
Deal	Kyl	Smith (OR)
DeLay	Lazio	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart	Leach	Snowe
Dickey	Levy	Solomon
Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Dornan	Lewis (FL)	Stearns
Dreier	Lightfoot	Stenholm
Duncan	Linder	Stump
Dunn	Livingston	Sundquist
Emerson	Machtley	Talent
English (OK)	Manzullo	Tauzin
Everett	McCandless	Taylor (NC)
Ewing	McCollum	Thomas (CA)
Fawell	McCrery	Thomas (WY)
Fields (TX)	McDade	Torkildsen
Fish	McHugh	Upton
Fowler	McInnis	Valentine
Franks (CT)	McKeon	Vucanovich
Franks (NJ)	McMillan	Walker
Gallely	Meyers	Weldon
Gallo	Mica	Wolf
Gekas	Michel	Young (AK)
Geren	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)
Gilchrest	Molinaro	Zeliff
Gillmor	Moorhead	Zimmer
Gilman	Morella	
Gingrich	Murphy	

NOES—244

Abercrombie	Andrews (ME)	Andrews (TX)
Ackerman	Andrews (NJ)	Applegate

Bacchus (FL)	Hamburg	Pallone
Baessler	Hamilton	Pastor
Barcia	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Barlow	Hastings	Payne (VA)
Barrett (WI)	Hayes	Pelosi
Becerra	Hefner	Penny
Beilenson	Hilliard	Peterson (FL)
Berman	Hinchey	Peterson (MN)
Bevill	Hoagland	Pickett
Bilbray	Hochbrueckner	Pickle
Bishop	Holden	Pomeroy
Blackwell	Hoyer	Poshard
Boehlert	Hughes	Price (NC)
Bonior	Hutto	Rahall
Borski	Inslee	Rangel
Boucher	Jacobs	Reed
Brewster	Jefferson	Reynolds
Brooks	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Browder	Johnson, E. B.	Roemer
Brown (CA)	Johnston	Rose
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski	Rostenkowski
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Rowland
Bryant	Kennedy	Royal-Allard
Byrne	Kennelly	Rush
Cantwell	Kildee	Sabo
Cardin	Kleczka	Sanders
Carr	Klein	Sangmeister
Chapman	Klink	Sarpaluis
Clay	Kopetski	Sawyer
Clayton	Kreidler	Schenk
Clement	LaFalce	Schroeder
Clyburn	Lambert	Schumer
Coleman	Lancaster	Scott
Collins (IL)	Lantos	Serrano
Collins (MI)	LaRocco	Sharp
Conyers	Laughlin	Shepherd
Cooper	Lehman	Skaegs
Coppersmith	Levin	Skelton
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Slattery
Coyne	Lipinski	Slaughter
Cramer	Lloyd	Smith (IA)
Danner	Long	Spratt
Darden	Lowey	Stark
de la Garza	Maloney	Stokes
DeFazio	Mann	Strickland
DeLauro	Manton	Studds
Dellums	Margolies	Stupak
Derrick	Mezvinsky	Swett
Deutsch	Markey	Swift
Dicks	Martinez	Synar
Dingell	Matsui	Tanner
Dixon	Mazzoli	Taylor (MS)
Dooley	McCloskey	Tejeda
Durbin	McCurdy	Thornton
Edwards (CA)	McDermott	Thurman
Edwards (TX)	McHale	Torres
Engel	McKinney	Torricelli
English (AZ)	McNulty	Towns
Eshoo	Meehan	Trafficant
Evans	Meek	Tucker
Fazio	Menendez	Unsold
Fields (LA)	Mfume	Velazquez
Filner	Miller (CA)	Vento
Fingerhut	Mineta	Visclosky
Flake	Minge	Volkmer
Foglietta	Mink	Walsh
Ford (MI)	Moakley	Washington
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Waters
Frost	Montgomery	Watt
Furse	Moran	Waxman
Gedden	Murtha	Wheat
Gephardt	Nadler	Whitten
Gibbons	Natcher	Williams
Glickman	Neal (MA)	Wilson
Gonzalez	Neal (NC)	Wise
Gordon	Oberstar	Woolsey
Green	Obey	Wyden
Gunderson	Oliver	Wynn
Gutierrez	Ortiz	Yates
Hall (OH)	Owens	

NOT VOTING—5

Barton	Henry	Quillen
Ford (TN)	Myers	

□ 0018

Mr. REED changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GREENWOOD and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 0020

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 190, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—235

Abercrombie	Frank (MA)	Minge
Ackerman	Frost	Mink
Andrews (ME)	Furse	Moakley
Andrews (NJ)	Gejdenson	Mollohan
Andrews (TX)	Gephardt	Moran
Applegate	Gibbons	Murphy
Bacchus (FL)	Glickman	Murtha
Baessler	Gonzalez	Nadler
Barcia	Gordon	Natcher
Barlow	Green	Neal (MA)
Barrett (WI)	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Becerra	Hall (OH)	Obey
Bellenson	Hamburg	Oliver
Berman	Hamilton	Ortiz
Bevill	Harman	Owens
Bilbray	Hastings	Pallone
Bishop	Hefner	Pastor
Blackwell	Hilliard	Payne (NJ)
Boehrlert	Hinchey	Payne (VA)
Bonior	Hoagland	Pelosi
Borski	Hochbrueckner	Penny
Boucher	Holden	Peterson (FL)
Brooks	Hoyer	Peterson (MN)
Browder	Hughes	Pickle
Brown (CA)	Inslee	Pomeroy
Brown (FL)	Jacobs	Poshard
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Price (NC)
Bryant	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Byrne	Johnson (SD)	Rangel
Cantwell	Johnson, E. B.	Reed
Cardin	Johnston	Reynolds
Carr	Kanjorski	Richardson
Chapman	Kaptur	Rogers
Clay	Kennedy	Rose
Clayton	Kennelly	Rostenkowski
Clement	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Kleczka	Rush
Coleman	Klein	Sabo
Collins (IL)	Klink	Sanders
Collins (MI)	Kopetski	Sangmeister
Conyers	Kreidler	Sarpallus
Cooper	LaFalce	Sawyer
Costello	Lambert	Schenk
Coyne	Lancaster	Schroeder
Cramer	Lantos	Schumer
Danner	LaRocco	Scott
Darden	Laughlin	Serrano
de la Garza	Lehman	Sharp
Deal	Levin	Shepherd
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
DeLauro	Lipinski	Skelton
Dellums	Lloyd	Slaterry
Derrick	Long	Slaughter
Deutsch	Lowe	Smith (IA)
Dicks	Maloney	Spratt
Dingell	Manton	Stark
Dixon	Markey	Stokes
Dooley	Martinez	Strickland
Durbin	Matsui	Studds
Edwards (CA)	Mazzoli	Stupak
Edwards (TX)	McCloskey	Sweet
Engel	McCurdy	Swift
English (AZ)	McDermott	Synar
Eshoo	McHale	Tanner
Evans	McKinney	Tejeda
Fazio	McNulty	Thornton
Fields (LA)	Meehan	Thurman
Filner	Meek	Torres
Fingerhut	Menendez	Torricelli
Flake	Mfume	Towns
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Trafiacant
Ford (MI)	Mineta	Tucker

Unsoeld
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Washington

Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson

Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—190

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Bartlett
Bartlett
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Billrakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Brewster
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Coppersmith
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallely
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling

NOT VOTING—5

Barton
Ford (TN)

Henry
Myers

Neal (NC)
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Valentine
Vucanovich
Walker
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

□ 0036

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of

trying to engage the majority whip in a little colloquy about the schedule for the remainder of the week and perhaps next week.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the schedule is that we will meet on next Tuesday, March 23, at noon and have 7 suspensions. Recorded votes on the suspensions will be postponed until Wednesday, the 24th of March.

Those bills are:

H.R. 904, to establish a National Commission to Ensure a Competitive Airline Industry, concur in Senate amendment.

House Joint Resolution 102, appointment of Barber B. Conable as a Citizen Regent of the Smithsonian Institution.

House Joint Resolution 104, appointment of Wesley S. Williams as a Citizen Regent of the Smithsonian Institution.

House Joint Resolution 105, appointment of Hanna Holburn Gray as a Citizen Regent of the Smithsonian Institution.

House Concurrent Resolution 41, use of rotunda to commemorate victims of the Holocaust.

H.R. 235, Idaho Land Exchange Act.

H.R. 720, Custer National Forest.

□ 0040

On Wednesday, March 24, and the balance of the week, Mr. Speaker, we will meet at 2 p.m. on Wednesday and at 11 a.m. on Thursday. We do not know about Friday as of yet.

Our schedule for Wednesday tentatively is to do H.R. 670, the Family Planning Amendments Act of 1993, subject to a rule.

We will let Members know about Friday as soon as we know, and, hopefully, that will be soon.

I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is interested in committee funding.

Mr. SOLOMON. Yes.

Mr. BONIOR. We have to do that, as the gentleman knows, by March 23, and we are not expected to do it next week at this time. We will probably do it the following week.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] says we will not expect to do the committee funding next week?

Mr. BONIOR. That is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. Then just to clarify again, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said the pending bills on Tuesday, if there were votes called for, they would be rolled over until Wednesday?

Mr. BONIOR. That is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. And we will take up the Family Planning Act amendments on Wednesday, and does the gentleman think in his opinion that there might be votes on Thursday on that bill as well?

Mr. BONIOR. We are anticipating votes at this point, yes.

Mr. SOLOMON. We are?

Mr. BONIOR. At this point.

Mr. SOLOMON. We are anticipating votes?

Mr. BONIOR. That could change, but right now we anticipate that Members should be aware that we will probably vote on Thursday.

Mr. SOLOMON. And does the gentleman have any idea about when we might be considering the debt limit which is reaching a critical period?

Mr. BONIOR. Well, we have to do it before the end of the month, and I suspect it would be the following week, not this coming week, but the following week.

Mr. SOLOMON. I see.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for enlightening the membership, and I hope he has a nice weekend.

Mr. BONIOR. The same to my friend from New York.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MARCH 19, 1993, TO TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 1993

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, Friday, March 19, 1993, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, March 23, 1993.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Hon. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, January 5, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to advise you that, pursuant to sec. 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code, the following Members of the Committee on Ways and Means have been designated to serve on the Joint Committee

on Taxation during the 103rd Congress: Dan Rostenkowski (D., IL), Sam M. Gibbons (D., FL), J.J. Pickle (D., TX), Bill Archer (R., TX), Philip M. Crane (R., IL).

Sincerely yours,

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
Chairman.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TALENT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. REGULA, for 60 minutes, on March 30.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. LAMBERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. LOWEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SYNAR, for 60 minutes, on March 23.

Mr. OLVER, for 60 minutes, on March 23.

Mr. OWENS for 60 minutes each day, on April 1, 2, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TALENT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BLILEY in two instances.

Mr. COMBEST in two instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. GINGRICH in two instances.

Mr. HENRY.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. LEACH in two instances.

Mr. KYL.

Ms. DUNN.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. HYDE.

Mr. ROGERS in two instances.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. SCHAEFER.

Mr. SANTORUM.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. OXLEY.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. PORTER.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. LAMBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MALONEY.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

Mrs. CLAYTON in two instances.

Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. MARKEY.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mrs. MEEK.

Mr. NADLER.

Mr. BROWN of California in two instances.

Mr. BARCIA.

Mr. SPRATT.

Mr. MORAN.

Mr. GIBBONS in two instances.

Mrs. THURMAN.

Mr. BORSKI.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. RICHARDSON in two instances.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. STUDDS in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 80. An act to increase the size of the Big Thicket National Preserve in the State of Texas by adding the Village Creek corridor unit, the Big Sandy corridor unit, and the Canyonlands unit; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 214. An act to authorize the construction of a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II and to commemorate United States participation in that conflict; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. 275. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the town of Taos, New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 326. An act to revise the boundaries of the George Washington Birthplace National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 328. An act to provide for the rehabilitation of historic structures within the Sandy Hook Unit of Gateway National Recreation Area in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 344. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Fox and Lower Wisconsin River corridors in the State of Wisconsin as a National Heritage Corridor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S.J. Res. 22. Joint resolution designating March 25, 1993, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy".

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution to proclaim March 20, 1993, as "National Agriculture Day".

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. LAMBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 23, 1993, at 12 noon.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Report and amended report of House committees concerning the foreign cur-

rency and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the third and fourth quarter of 1992, in connection with foreign

travel pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1992

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Debbie Gebhardt	8/24	8/26	Japan		484.00		(3)				484.00
	8/26	9/4	China		1,752.00		(3)				1,752.00
	9/5	9/6	Thailand		213.00		(3)				213.00
	9/6	9/7	Hong Kong		516.00		(3)				516.00
Committee total											2,965.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Air transportation provided by USAF.

NORMAN Y. MINETA, Chairman, Mar. 11, 1993.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1992

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mike Synar	12/20	12/27	South Africa		1,418.50						1,418.50
	12/28	12/30	Belgium		542.00						542.00
Commercial transportation							6,423.44				6,423.44
Committee total					1,960.50		6,423.44				8,383.94

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JACK BROOKS, Chairman, Mar. 1, 1993.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

918. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's 1992 report on the Supportive Housing Demonstration Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 11387; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

919. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to Mexico, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

920. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's semiannual report of activities and efforts relating to utilization of the private sector, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1827; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

921. A letter from the President and CEO, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting a report entitled "Progress of Investigations of Professional Conduct through December 31, 1992", pursuant to Public Law 101-647, section 2540 (104 Stat. 4885); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

922. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a notice of Final Funding Priorities for the Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

923. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting Final Regulations—In-

stitutional Eligibility under the Higher Education Act of 1965, As Amended; Student Assistance General Provisions, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

924. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting a notice of meeting related to the International Energy Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

925. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Operations.

926. A letter from the President, Inter-Americans Foundation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

927. A letter from the Acting Senior Deputy Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

928. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative and Public Affairs, National Science Foundation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

929. A letter from the Executive Director, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar

year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

930. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

931. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

932. A letter from the Secretary, Naval Sea Cadet Corps, transmitting the Annual Audit Report to the Corps for the year ended December 31, 1992, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(39), 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

933. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting a report on assessment of threats in domestic airport security, pursuant to Public Law 101-604, section 106(d) (104 Stat. 3075); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACCHUS of Florida (for himself, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. PAXON, Mr. CAMP, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. KLUG,

Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GENE GREEN, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 1395. A bill to amend section 207 of title 18, United States Code, to tighten restrictions on former executive and legislative branch officials and employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEILENSEN (for himself and Mr. LEACH):

H.R. 1396. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for a voluntary system of spending limits and partial public financing for House of Representatives election campaigns, to prohibit contributions by multicandidate political committees, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Post Office and Civil Service, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 1397. A bill to prohibit the importation of goods produced abroad with child labor and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARDIN:

H.R. 1398. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Social Security Act to provide for health insurance coverage for workers and the public in a manner that contains the costs of health care in the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. KLUG, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. TORKILDSEN):

H.R. 1399. A bill to provide that certain new Federal programs shall terminate no later than 5 years after the date of enactment of the law that establishes the programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 1400. A bill to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the purchase of broadcasting time by candidates for public office; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 1401. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove U.S. tax barriers inhibiting competitiveness of U.S. owned businesses operating in the European Community; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. GENE GREEN, Mr. TAUZIN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FILNER, Ms. THURMAN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. REED, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. TORRICELLI):

H.R. 1402. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide effective trade remedies under the countervailing and antidumping duty laws against foreign-built ships that are subsidized or dumped and to provide otherwise for fair trade for the U.S. shipbuilding and repair industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 1403. A bill to ensure that the Caribbean Basin Initiative is not adversely af-

ected by the implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement and to apply "fast track" approval procedures to free trade agreements entered into between the United States and certain Caribbean Basin countries; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Rules.

By Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER:

H.R. 1404. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that amounts received by a veteran in a legal settlement with the Department of Veterans Affairs for injuries arising from the negligence of the Department shall be excluded from determinations with respect to annual income for purposes of programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that are income-based; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1405. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the formula for payments to States for care furnished to veterans in State homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KENNELLY (for herself, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. GEPHARDT):

H.R. 1406. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of the rehabilitation credit under the passive activity limitations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MALONEY:

H.R. 1407. A bill to prohibit government-to-government and commercial arms sales to any country that is participating in or cooperating with the boycott of Israel by Arab countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Ms. LOWEY, Mrs. MINK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. FROST, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. LLOYD, and Ms. MALONEY):

H.R. 1408. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address gender equity in mathematics and science education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMAS of California:

H.R. 1409. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce compliance costs and administrative burdens in connection with foreign taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1410. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the deduction for States and local income and franchise taxes shall not be allocated to foreign source income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1411. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to double the maximum benefit under the special estate tax valuation rules for certain farm, and so forth, real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. UNSOELD:

H.R. 1412. A bill to establish a National Shellfish Safety Program; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DREIER:

H.R. 1413. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the penalty imposed on wage income earned by individuals who have attained retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DORNAN, Mr.

SKEEN, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. ZELIFF):

H.R. 1414. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide for making determinations of whether a species is an endangered species or a threatened species other than solely on the basis of the best scientific and commercial data available, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER:

H.R. 1415. A bill to provide veterans benefits to certain individuals serving in the U.S. merchant marine in a combat zone during a period of war, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 1416. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include liability to pay compensation under workmen's compensation acts within the rules relating to certain personal liability assignments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida:

H.R. 1417. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to restore the leave rights of certain employees; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. LOWEY:

H.R. 1418. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the treatment of tenant-stockholders in cooperative housing corporations also shall apply to stockholders of corporations that only own the land on which the residences are located; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself and Mr. LEWIS of Florida):

H.R. 1419. A bill to authorize research and evaluation programs for monitoring, detecting, and abating lead based paint and other lead exposure hazards in housing, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Dakota, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 1420. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require ingredient labeling for malt beverages, wine, and distilled spirits and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SABO, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. YATES, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WHEAT):

H.R. 1421. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation and

the manufacture of firearms designed to accept a silencer, bayonet, grenade launcher, flash suppressor, or folding stock, of certain ammunition feeding devices, and of related devices, and to provide for the imposition of enhanced penalties for the possession or the use of any such item in a crime of violence or in a drug trafficking crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 1422. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny any deduction for expenses in connection with the cutting of old-growth redwood timber and certain other redwood timber and to impose an excise tax on the cutting of such timber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STENHOLM (for himself, Mr.

ALLARD, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. EWING, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. KYL, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Ms. LONG, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WILSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H.R. 1423. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow licensed veterinarians to order the extra-label use of drugs in animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1424. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 5-month waiting period required in order for an individual to be eligible for benefits based on disability or for the disability freeze and to eliminate the 24-month waiting period for disabled individuals to become eligible for Medicare benefits; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 1425. A bill to improve the management, productivity, and use of Indian agricultural lands and resources; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 1426. A bill to provide for the maintenance of dams located on Indian lands by the

Bureau of Indian Affairs or through contracts with Indian tribes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 1427. A bill to extend the existing suspension of duty on tetraamino biphenyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAMS (for himself, Mr. BART-

LETT, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. EWING, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. MINGE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 1428. A bill to rescind funds appropriated for the Select Committee on Aging, the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, the Select Committee on Hunger, and the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, effective April 1, 1993; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself, Mrs.

KENNELLY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut):

H.J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to designate the month of November in 1993 and 1994 as "National Hospice Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Ms.

McKINNEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. LAUGHLIN):

H. Res. 134. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to cause the publication of Members signing a discharge motion; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself, Mr.

DINGELL, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H. Res. 135. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission take certain action; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DUNN:

H. Res. 136. Resolution requiring that unexpended balances in the official allowances of Members of the House of Representatives be returned to the Treasury for deficit reduction; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

59. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of New Mexico, relative to placing conditional human rights provisions on the "Most Favored Nation" trade status of China; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BLILEY introduced a bill (H.R. 1429) for the relief of Charlotte S. Neal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. FORD of Michigan and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 5: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. REED, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. STUDDS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BEVILL, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 58: Mr. HORN.

H.R. 59: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. LINDER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 112: Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 115: Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WATT, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. TUCKER, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 140: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 142: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 146: Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 147: Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 159: Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 167: Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 171: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 212: Mr. REGULA.

H.R. 359: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 425: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 426: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 449: Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 496: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 498: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ.

H.R. 513: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. EWING, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. KIM, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 535: Mr. MINETA, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARR, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. GENE GREEN, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. LLOYD, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SWETT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 539: Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GINGRICH, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 558: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. DORNAN, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. HUTTO, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 561: Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. PARKER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 640: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana.

H.R. 649: Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 667: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 676: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. COX, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 684: Mr. EWING.

H.R. 692: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 700: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 739: Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 749: Mr. ORTON, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Ms. THURMAN.

H.R. 771: Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 796: Mr. EVANS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DeLAURO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. STARK, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. SCHENK, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 799: Mr. ALLARD and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 826: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 887: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 894: Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 895: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. EWING.

H.R. 896: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. EWING, and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 930: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PENNY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. BREWSTER, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 947: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. DeFAZIO, and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 962: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. EWING, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. LAUGHLIN.

H.R. 967: Mr. McHUGH, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. GILLMORE, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. McDADE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KYL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, and Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 1013: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. McHALE, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1025: Mr. McHALE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HAMBURG, Ms. MEEK, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1026: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LINDER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CANADY, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1048: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina and Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 1067: Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 1085: Mr. MCCOLLUM and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1086: Mr. DORNAN and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 1087: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 1099: Mr. MACHTLEY and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 1121: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. BREWSTER.

H.R. 1131: Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 1135: Mr. LAZIO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1141: Mr. THOMAS of California and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1142: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ORTON, and Mr. EWING.

H.R. 1145: Mr. LEVY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1152: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BERUTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1153: Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FROST, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 1157: Mr. BLUTE, Mr. LAZIO, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 1164: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1169: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 1195: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. SPENCE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1200: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SABO, and Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 1208: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1222: Mr. WOLF, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EWING, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1251: Mr. SARPALIUS and Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 1276: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

H.R. 1285: Mr. STARK, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 1301: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.J. Res. 38: Mr. BARCIA.

H.J. Res. 78: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ORTON, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.J. Res. 84: Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MANN, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. KLINK, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN, Ms. SNOWE, and Mrs. MINK.

H.J. Res. 92: Mr. STUDDS, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FISH, Mr. LANCASTER, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr.

SABO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. FLAKE.

H.J. Res. 94: Mr. SPRATT and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.J. Res. 103: Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. DERRICK, and Ms. LONG.

H.J. Res. 111: Mr. UPTON, Mr. MANTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.J. Res. 130: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. De LUGO, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mrs. BENTLEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, and Mr. FROST.

H.J. Res. 149: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. WALSH.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. McKEON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. GENE GREEN, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. BARNETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H. Con. Res. 46: Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H. Con. Res. 52: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. MCCURDY.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. THOMAS of California.

H. Res. 41: Mr. ISTOOK.

H. Res. 53: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. KIM, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KING, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. ISTOOK.

H. Res. 86: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD, Ms. SCHENK, and Ms. WATERS.

H. Res. 108: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. ARMEY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BALLENGER, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. DANNER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. KIM.

H. Res. 118: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. LEVY, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. LAUGHLIN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

19. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Washington State Bar Association, relative to funding for the Legal Services Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.